The EXAMINER EXAMINED.

Andover Newton Theological Library
Newton Centre
Massachusetts
BP
700

REMARKS

On a PIECE wrote by Mr. *Isaac Backus*, of *Middleborough*; printed in 1768.

(Called,
"An Examination of Nine SERMONS from MATTH. 16. 18.
"publiſhed laſt Year, by Mr. JOSEPH FISH, of *Stonington*.")

WHEREIN

Thoſe SERMONS are vindicated, from the Exceptions taken againſt them by Mr. *Backus*---Many of his Errors confuted, and his Miſtakes corrected.

By *Joſeph Fiſh*, A. M.

PASTOR of a CHURCH in STONINGTON,
And Author of ſaid SERMONS.

2 Tim. 2. 25. *In Meekneſs inſtructing thoſe that oppoſe themſelves, if God peradventure will give them Repentance to the acknowledging of the Truth.*

NEW-LONDON:
Printed and Sold by *Timothy Green*,
M.DCC.LXXI.

INTRODUCTION.

Chapter I.

Shewing the ſpirit and temper with which all controverſies ſhould be managed.

IN all ſerious debates, there is ſome *truth* of importance, in the queſtion, which both the contending parties, profeſs an equal regard for, and to be in purſuit of; implying a readineſs to ſubmit to it, wherever it appears.

THEREFORE, in managing all our controverſies, the *firſt* regard ſhould be paid to *truth*, in honour to him who has ſtyled himſelf, *a God of truth* and *without iniquity*: and *next*, to the good of him or them that gainſay it.

HAVING this worthy deſign in view, all diſputes ſhould be conducted, in the moſt friendly manner, with all proper tokens of mutual reſpect, and in the temper and language of the goſpel. This would be to diſpute like *men*, and as becomes chriſtian friends, that love one another, aiming at each others good; and not as perſonal enemies, who, from the pride of their hearts, are concerned for nothing ſo much as the *victory*, whether the cauſe they have eſpouſed, be right or wrong.

SUPPOSING I am ſo unhappy, as to have embrac'd an error; and, by argument am convinced of it; 'tis ſurely mortification enough for me, to own my fault and retract: and glory enough to my antagoniſt, that he has been inſtrumental of ſetting me right; and ſufficient matter of thankfulneſs to *both*, that *one* who had grievouſly erred, has found and embraced the truth at laſt.

IN all this there is not the leaſt need of one bitter, inſulting word, nor of an unkind reflection: nor can there any purpoſe be anſwered thereby, but that of venting the corruption of nature,—provoking to wrath, and adding affliction to the afflicted. But how ungenerous would this be, to our erring brethren?

'Tis,

'Tis, in itself, bad enough to err from the truth; as the parties suppose of each other: Why then should one strive to make the other more miserable, by insulting or despising of him?—'Tis enough for a weary traveller, (that has unhappily miss'd his way) to be told by one he meets, *that he is wrong*, and must go back again, to such a road, e'er he can proceed to advantage. Hard indeed, that he must not only repeat his painful steps, to recover the ground he has lost, but must be railed on into the bargain.

SUCH virulent treatment of one another, in an argument, serves only to corrupt the judgment and to provoke each others resentment; which draws off their attention from the object, *truth*, which alone they profess to have in their view. So that the cause of truth, having suffer'd, in the hands of its professed defenders, appears in a disadvantageous light, to the serious and inquisitive *reader*: who, instead of listning to the force of reasoning that the subject may be cleared up in his mind, has his attention to the argument interrupted, by the railing of the parties; which, I must think, is just matter of offence, to every serious mind.

IN controversy, I apprehend, an author's proper business is to confute his opponent, by certain facts, or solid reasoning, and scriptures well apply'd: while the reader should sit as an impartial judge of their reasoning; and ought not to have any thing thrown in his way, to beget a personal prejudice; (as railery too often does), but should be left entirely to the weight and force of *argument*, to determine his judgment, in favour of *this* or the *other* side of the question.

WHY then can't we in all our public disputes, and about matters too of great importance in religion, behave ourselves towards one another, as civilly as we do in the common affairs of life? that is, endeavour to shew each other his supposed mistake, with a christian temper, and in language that is clean and decent: that so, by a courteous and obliging behaviour, we may provoke to unity in affection and esteem, however wide a-part we may be in sentiment —— This would greatly serve, not only to our personal benefit and comfort, but to spread a happy influence on all about us; especially if we are *ministers* of the meek and lowly Jesus, who are set for examples to the flock, in *word* and in *spirit*, as well as in *faith* and *purity*.

HOPING for a measure of the Spirit, above described, with my eye upon the rules laid down (which are much easier drawn than practic'd,) I shall now apply myself to examine, consider and answer what Mr *Backus* has wrote against my Sermons on Matth. 16. 18. *Upon this rock I will build my church*, &c.

NOT that I ſhall undertake to correct *every thing*, which I think is wrong, in that remarkable piece; (however eaſily done,) as the exceptionable things are too numerous, to be noticed and reply'd to, without being tedious. And beſides, I don't think myſelf obliged to defend *every* man's character, which he has attacked, (for there are but few, of any rank or order, that have eſcaped his pen,) nor to follow him, (at leaſt very far) in things that are foreign to my ſubject. But *ſome* of the moſt *material* things in his book, which I think are injurious to the cauſe of truth, and eſpecially ſuch as do more immediately affect *my ſermons*, ſhall be duly attended to; and, I hope, ſet in their proper light.

BUT as Mr. B. has entirely miſtaken my ſermons, in numerous paſſages of them, and thereupon charged me with injurious treatment of the ſeparates and baptiſts; yea, with many falſehoods, inconſiſtences, groſs errors, &c. it therefore ſeems neceſſary that ſeveral things ſhould be premiſed, to ſet the *ſermons* in their true light, before I enter upon the main deſign, of anſwering the particulars of his book; that the reader may be able to form a right judgment of things, ſo differently repreſented.

Chapter II.

Things premiſed, to ſhew the true reading of the ſermons under conſideration, whereby many objections and charges of falſehood, will appear to be groundleſs.

1. AS my ſubject led me to ſpeak of many *facts*, which thro' the imperfection of my own memory and the miſinformation of others, I might poſſibly make ſome miſtake about, in circumſtantial points; I therefore deſired, in my preface to thoſe ſermons, page 4. "*That if I had, in any inſtances, miſtaken facts, &c. it "might be corrected, and hop'd it would be looked upon and treated "as a ſimple and undeſigned miſtake.*" Which I thought might entitle me, in ſome meaſure, to the candour of any diſcerning eye, that ſhould diſcover ſuch miſtakes. But have fail'd with Mr B.

2. IF, notwithſtanding all the gentleneſs that I felt, and tho't I ſhewed, there be any that think my expreſſions about the *ſeparates*, are too pointed and ſevere, Let it be conſidered,

THAT I was giving an account of *the falſe ſpirit* which operated in thoſe days, *as it was then*. Now, this is a ſpirit directly contrary

trary to the ſpirit of Chriſt, or eſſentially different from it. And yet ſets itſelf up for a chriſtian ſpirit, and will be even exaſperated if it is not honoured as the ſpirit of Chriſt.

THIS ſpirit I had to do with—And therefore the ſeverities that ſome may think I uſe with *the ſeparates*, are to be conſider'd as levelled againſt *that ſpirit*, rather than againſt the *perſons*, in whom it appeared and wrought ſo terribly. As for the *perſons* in whom there appeared ſo much as a *glimmering* of the image & ſpirit of Chriſt, I can truly ſay, they were *then*, & *ſtill* are, dear to me. But the bitter miſchievous ſpirit, that had got into ſome of them, and influenced ſo great a part of their conduct, THIS I oppoſed, becauſe antichriſtian, and allow'd myſelf to treat with proper tokens of diſlike.

Now, let us view that falſe and bitter ſpirit, acting out itſelf, in ways ſo contrary to the ſpirit of the goſpel, (view *this*,) as the object before me, the fierce, wild creature that I had *then* to encounter, and, in *writing* to deſcribe, and I cannot think that any judicious and unprejudic'd perſon will cenſure me, as being in the leaſt ſevere.

3. IT is to be particularly obſerved, that my diſcourſes are about the *ſeparatisns at Stonington*; and not deſigned as exactly deſcriptive of the ſeparates, in all other places.

ALTHO' indeed, I ſuppoſed that there was a very great agreement among the ſeparates, as to their ſpirit and conduct, thro' the land: For as the *true* ſpirit wrought harmoniouſly, ſo the *falſe*: So that their true character drawn in one place, would in ſome meaſure anſwer their character every where elſe: And therefore many expreſſions, taken by themſelves, may have a general look as including the whole ſect. Yet what I had *primarily* in view, was the ſeparations in *this town*, and more eſpecially thoſe of my own pariſh. And if what I ſay be *true* of the ſeparates *among us*, in this limited ſenſe, there is no ground of complaint, nor room to accuſe me of *falſe repreſentation*, altho' my account of *theſe* don't exactly agree with all the ſeparates elſewhere.

THIS is by no means an evaſion; but an important *reality*; which ought to be kept in mind by the reader, through all my diſcourſes, on the ſubject of ſeparations; and muſt be heedfully obſerved, in the preſent diſpute, between me and Mr. *Backus*; that it may appear, whether I have given any occaſion, for his calling me repeatedly, *a falſe accuſer*.

MY ſermons will ſpeak for themſelves, to every attentive reader, that the ſeparations at *Stonington*, and particularly thoſe of my own pariſhioners, were the ſubject which they are concerned a-

bout

bout: and that they are not to be underſtood of the ſeparations in other places, any otherways than as *theirs* are ſimilar to *ours*; unleſs where I do particularly mention, or evidently refer to the ſeparates abroad.

THE whole preface ſhows what I here advance, particularly p. 5. bottom—"*I intend no unkind reflection upon my chriſtian breth-*" *ren that have forſaken* my miniſtry."—And accordingly I addreſſed myſelf to *them*, (p. 6. preface) as tho' I had ſpoken of none others in my diſcourſes. Which ſhows, that when I had compleated the work, I verily tho't that I had been giving an account of my own pariſhioners, and not of the ſeparates in general. This alſo appears from p. 113. towards bottom, "How "the ſeparations began in the *land*"—here, indeed, is a tranſient glance at ſeparations, in general; ſuppoſing them *elſewhere*, to be ſimilar to *ours*: but ſuch a general view of them is not *retained*, as the ſubject of my intended diſcourſe; for *that* is reſtricted to *theſe* at home; as appears from the next words, viz: "and *among* "*us, more eſpecially*." "Or" (as I go on) "what were the lead-"ing ſteps towards them,—what things they were offended at, "what their principles were,—the reaſons which they offered "for ſeparating,—the ſpirit which they diſcover'd and went off "with."——This diviſion of the work, in every part of it, points directly *to my own people* and neighbours; as the handling of each particular, in its proper place, does manifeſtly ſhow—And conſequently what follows, viz. "the *tendency* of theſe ſeparations," which is the laſt branch of the work, muſt neceſſarily refer to thoſe ſeparations that took place *here among us*, which I have given account of.

THE ſixth ſermon is chiefly taken up with the leading ſteps to the ſeparations,—giving a particular account of the falſe ſpirit and errors that appeared in good Mr. *Davenport*; and is finiſhed with this obſervation, p. 129. middle, viz. "And that the "ſeparations *among us*," (in italic characters) took their riſe—"their firſt principles from the *ſame*, or *like*, falſe ſpirit, will fur-"ther appear, under the following heads, which are the ſubject "of the remaining diſcourſes." Which plainly ſhows, that the remaining diſcourſes, which treat wholly of the ſeparations, muſt refer to the *ſame people* above mentioned.

THIS further appears from the *ſeventh ſermon*, p. 130. title, "Shewing what the ſeparates took offence at—their principles "and *reaſons* for ſeparating." And next paſſage, "ſhew what "it was that offended *theſe brethren*, and occaſioned their leaving "*us*."

HERE

HERE observe two things, (1.) the ſubject and deſign of this ſermon is, to "ſhew their *principles* and *reaſons* for ſeparating." *Whoſe* reaſons can I be here ſuppoſed to ſpeak of, but the *reaſons* which my *own people* gave? Sure I am, I mentioned none other than what I found upon *church record*, as entred from their own mouths. And their *principles*, connected here, with their *reaſons*, were the principles of the ſame people. And (2.) Its being ſaid, "what it was that offended theſe brethren, and occaſioned their "leaving *of us*," confirms the point in hand, that I was ſpeaking immediately of my pariſhioners and townſmen. Accordingly the whole of this *ſeventh* ſermon, in every paragraph of it, ſpeaks of the ſeparates in *Stonington*, and gives an account of *their* errors, principles, and reaſons for ſeparating; which, with other things that I ſay of them, are *true*, as I ſhall prove, by living witneſſes, in its proper place; ſince Mr. B. charges me with *falſehood*, ſaying, preface p. 5. "I knew they were not ſo."

THE *eighth* ſermon, which cloſes my account of the ſeparations, carries on the ſame deſign, and ſpeaks of the ſame people, viz. the ſeparates in Stonington, p. 153. title of the 8th ſermon, "giving ſome account of the ſpirit *which they diſcovered* and went off with." ——Which *they* diſcovered—*they*—a *relative*, whoſe antecedent muſt be the *people* or *perſons*, that I had before ſpoken of, viz. the ſeparates of this town; more eſpecially thoſe that had ſeparated from *my miniſtry*, as hath been already ſhown.—And therefore thoſe ſeparations, the *tendency* of which I propoſed, in the laſt place to ſpeak of muſt be *the ſeparations* with all their ingredients, which *thoſe* people made in this place: Which will hold good of all *ſuch* ſeparations in any other places.

INDEED, there are ſome paſſages, in this ſermon, which, taken ſingly by themſelves, may give the reader a latitude of thought, to conſtrue them of the ſeparates *in general*: and ſo may not be minutely true of *all*, or of *numbers* in other places. Yet thoſe paſſages, taken with their connections, in foregoing ſermons, and with what goes *before* and *after* them, in *this* ſermon; (which is an approved method of conſtruing all writings;) and they will be found to be ſtrictly true of the people or perſons of whom I am there ſpeaking, viz. of my own.——Beſides, there are a multitude of paſſages in this 8th ſermon, which muſt convince every obſerving reader, (who is willing to underſtand them as intended;) that I was giving account of theſe ſeparations *at home*, and did not intend that every thing which I ſaid of *theſe* ſhould be applied to the *whole* denomination; tho' I thought *then*, and do *ſtill*, that what I ſaid is generally true of *all*.——I ſhall only clear

two

two or three paſſages that look, at firſt view, as if they cannot be underſtood in the reſtricted ſenſe above, but as if I was ſpeaking of *all* the ſeparates and their churches.—Sermon 8 p. 160. "To "inform how the *ſeparates churches came into being*, or ſprung up "*among us.*"—*The ſeparate churches*,—intimating, that I ſpake of *all* their churches in the land; as ſome may think. But the explanation is eaſy—For there are *three* churches in this town, that went off, in a ſeparating manner, from the ſeveral congregations in it; but chiefly from mine. One of them, indeed, profeſſed itſelf a *baptiſt* church; who had many of the ſame, or like wild notions with others, in thoſe times. The *ſecond* was a proper ſeparate church, profeſſing congregational principles. The *third* held a *mix'd communion*, when the firſt went off: plunging *adult* believers; and, at the ſame time, admitting of infant baptiſm, and ſprinkling (by ſome or other elders in that way,) to all that deſired it; as I have ever underſtood the matter. And *theſe* differed in nothing material, that I know of, from our common ſeparates. So that there were *ſeparate churches*—a number of them, in this place.—And, at the ſame time, I ſuppoſe that the ſeparate churches, in other places in the land, "ſprang up" much after the ſame manner as here.

AGAIN I ſay, p. 161. bottom, "Thoſe that have ſeparated from *our churches*, particularly *in this place*," as if I was ſpeaking of the ſeparations from *all* the churches, elſewhere. To which I reply; there were *three* ſtanding churches and miniſters, in this town, when the ſeparations firſt took place among us. From each of which there were numbers that ſeparated. Two of which ſtanding churches have ſince united—now but *two* in the town. And when they left theſe our churches, they ſeparated from *all*, both miniſters and churches, of the ſtanding order, in the land.—So that the expreſſion is true, if taken largely, of *all* the churches, while the limitation of my account, to my own people, is ſtrictly preſerved.

THUS having ſhown, that my diſcourſes do immediately and primarily reſpect the ſeparations at home, and are not to be underſtood of the ſeparations abroad, or in general; only wherein there is a general likeneſs; which ſets aſide a great part of Mr. B's book, and particularly deſtroys the foundation upon which he has ſo frequently charged me with being "a falſe accuſer of "the brethren," I ſhall only premiſe one thing more, and proceed to another ſubject.

4. *'Tis to be particularly obſerved*, that the *church* of Chriſt deſcribed in my ſermons, is his church in a *large* ſenſe, "that is,

" his *visible church* upon earth, which is made up of all those " that profess faith in Christ and subjection to the laws of his " kingdom." p. 6. my book. *These*, with their *children*, are the church of Christ so often mentioned in my sermons.

AGREEABLE to Cambridge Platform, in the confession of faith, p. 43. " The whole body of men, throughout the world, pro- " fessing the faith of the gospel, and obedience unto God, by " Christ, according unto it, not destroying their own profession " by any errors, everting the foundation, or unholiness of conver- " sation, *They and their children* with them, may be called the " *visible, catholick* church of Christ."

WESTMINSTER confession of faith, says the like, p. 97. " It consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the " true religion, together *with their children*, and is the kingdom " of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God."

THE church of Christ, in this large sense, was the object I had before me, and gave some account of. In which, no doubt, there are numbers of graceless persons.——Mr. B. in his examination, takes the word *church* in a quite different sense; as I shall shew in the next chapter; and so has much to object against my account of the churches.

I SHALL now consider some of the passages, quoted by Mr. B. and, thro' his mistake, charged with falsehood; proving them to be *true*, in the sense of those discourses, as already confirmed: that the reader may be convinced, that I have said nothing *against the truth, but for the truth.*

Chapter III.

Clearing some passages in my sermons, from the falsehood charged upon them by Mr. B.

IN his preface p. 5. top, he says, that " to be silent now, would " be a letting many things pass for truth, *which I knew were* " *not so*, tho' many others did not know it."——This he founds upon a passage quoted out of my book, p. 164. bottom, which compared with p. 137. near bottom, and p. 144. 3d head top, refers directly to the things that I had delivered in the seventh sermon: and *that*, as before noted, is wholly taken up about the separations that happened among my own parishioners; (as any one may see who reads that discourse;) and don't concern the separates elsewhere, only as *they* had the same things among them. Therefore, for Mr. B. to say, " he knew they were not so," must

suppose

ſuppoſe that *he* ſpoke of things that he was acquainted with *elſe-where*, and not of things *among us*; which *I knew were true*, the Mr. B. did not. And ſo *he* ſpoke of *one* thing, *I* of *another*. Therefore he ſpoke beſide the purpoſe.——P. 32. top, "I have "been thus particular," ſays Mr. B. "to open the nature of "that conſtitution," (ſtanding churches) "to ſhew the true "cauſe of *our ſeparation* therefrom." And p. 32. bottom, and 33. top, "a number of ſeparations were produced by that means," (viz. Mr. Davenport's judging ſome miniſters, and calling people to ſeparate from them,) "But thoſe ſeparations were not from "the conſtitution," &c. but "only from particular miniſters. "Whereas *our* ſeparations began *ſeveral years* afterwards, and "upon quite different principles."

REPLY; if ſo, Mr. B. has nothing to do with me, in this point. For the ſeparations that I ſpeak of, are thoſe that took their origin from Mr. Davenport's conduct *among us*, as repreſented in my book; i. e. the ſeeds and firſt principles of them, were then ſown. Accordingly, my ſeparate brethren did not fetch their pleas for ſeparating, ſo much from the *conſtitution*, as from other quarters; as appears from their printed reaſons. And therefore Mr. B. entirely miſſes his mark: for I have nothing to do with what he calls "*our ſeparations*," if he means thoſe at *Canterbury* or any where elſe beſides *Stonington*.—Therefore, alſo, what he adds, p. 33. top, "yet Mr. *Fiſh* would lay them *all* at his" (i. e. Mr. *Davenport*'s) "door," is foreign to the purpoſe, or not true: for I lay *none* but our *own*, at his door, in my diſcourſe; and *theſe* will ſtand rightly charged, till Mr B. proves that *my brethren* were not influenced to *leave us*, by the unhappy conduct of *that* good man: which I believe is out of his power. P. 41. Mr. B. quotes and cenſures a paſſage in p. 165. my book, where 'tis ſaid, "while we give the ſeparates credit for their verbal conceſſion, "that *learning* is a good thing, &c. we muſt charge them with "ſaying, &c. and confirming of it by *practice*, that there is no "need of any more than *common learning*, (nor indeed any *neceſ-"ſity* for *that*, if they have but *the Spirit*,) to qualify men for the "work of the miniſtry. And accordingly they chooſe *unlearned* "men, and have none but *ſuch*, for their teachers. Neither do "they uſe the means for obtaining any better accompliſhments. "Which ſhows, that they make no account of colleges, and ſu-"perior ſchools of learning, to educate their ſons." "This" (ſays Mr. B. p. 41. bottom) "is laid againſt *us all*, and without "exception,"—which he repreſents as a falſe charge. And p. 43. middle, adds, "I leave Mr. Fiſh to conſider how he can

"anſwer

" anſwer what he has ſaid, either to God or man." And next line, " tho' *his charge* is far from *truth*," &c.

REPLY; the accuſed paſſage above, is *ſtrictly true*, of the people whom I was *immediately* giving an account of, viz. *my pariſhioners* and *neighbours* in town, both *ſeparates* and *baptiſts*.

I HAVE already obſerved, that there are three churches in town, of that ſort, who went off from the ſtanding churches. And ſince they left *us*, they have had *ſix ordained elders*; all them *unlearned*, *common*, *labouring* men. Beſides a great number of *exhorters*, public *ſpeakers*, ſome of them *preaching* occaſionally, as they were moved.

NOT *one* of either of theſe denominations, in this town, has ever ſent a ſon to college, ſince they left us, now above twenty years, nor given *one* any more than our common *ſchool learning*, to accompliſh him for ſuperiour ſervice. So that they *practically* ſay, " there is no need of any more than *common learning*, to qua-" lify a man for the work of the miniſtry;" And by the above account it appears, " that they do not uſe the means for obtain-" ing better accompliſhments."

AND as a further evidence of their ſetting light by learning, in reſpect to miniſterial furniture, there have been inſtances among us, of great numbers, of the ſeparate way, flocking after a noted *exhorter* or *teacher*, that could not *read* a *word* in the bible; but being full of zeal, has ſpoken (I have heard) to the admiration of his hearers. This gave me reaſon to ſay, as above, " nor indeed " any *neceſſity* for *that*, (i. e. *common learning*) if they have but " the Spirit."

THUS truly have I ſpoken of my ſeparate brethren and neighbours in town, of whom I have ſhown that my diſcourſes are to be underſtood. And in theſe things, I ſuppoſe, they have not been unlike to the ſeparates in general abroad.

So that what Mr. B. has offered, p. 42. 43. to prove that my account *is not true*, by giving inſtances to the contrary in *Norwich*, *Canterbury* and elſewhere, is entirely out of the queſtion, even if they were *indeed* as he repreſents them; which account of his I ſhall correct, when I have added,

THAT my obſervation above, concerning the ſeparates having none but *unlearned teachers* is true, if laid " againſt them all, " without exception," as Mr. B. ſays my words do import. For they have not *one college learned* teacher, i. e. ordained *teacher*, in all or any of their churches, thro' the land, that ever I heard of, or can find. And 'twas evidently *college learning* that I ſpake of, in that paragraph of my ſermon; for it concludes thus, viz.

" which

" which shows that they make no account of colleges or superi-
" our schools of learning to educate their sons." And there are many other passages in this sermon, that plainly show, that by *learning* and *learned* men, I intend such as have a *liberal education*. He adds, p. 41. bottom, " our *practice* is appealed to, for the " proof of the charge; then (says he) let *that* be examined."—The first that he mentions are Messi'rs *the Paines*; both of them ordained pastors, in the separate churches, as he tells us, p. 42. top. But neither of them have any claim to the character in question. For though " Mr. *Elisha Paine* of Canterbury, was " one of the greatest *lawyers* in that colony," and " his brother " Solomon had been a *leading man* in the town, and their *repre-* " *sentative* at the general court," as Mr. B. observes, yet this by no means proves them to be gentlemen of a *liberal education*,—*such* learned men as I spake of, and said the separates had not, as teachers in their churches.

His argument, put into form, stands thus,

If some of the ordained pastors, in the separate churches, were *lawyers; leading men* and *representatives* at the *general court*, then they have learned men, or men of a liberal education for their teachers.

But the two ordained pastors above, viz. the *Paines*, were such:

Therefore the separates have, in their churches, learned men, or men of a liberal education, for their teachers.

Every one sees that the consequence is not true; and that his argument, from the *Paines*, does not touch what I advanced, even if they had been separate teachers in *this place*, much less as they are, one at Canterbury and the other at Long-Island.

And as to those " other ordained pastors" (in the separate churches) " who have considerable skill in both the Greek and " Latin tongues," p. 43. middle, allowing it to be so, it don't prove his point, that they had *college learning*. So these instances avail him nothing, even if they were teachers at *Stonington*: Less still, as they are *somewhere out* of town; and so *out* of the question.

Touching Messi'rs *the Cleavelands*,—as Mr. B. leaves them in p. 43. one might naturally conclude, that they are separate teachers, *even now*. For he tells us, " They were expelled, &c. " and became teachers among the separates."—If they were so for a while; yet they are now settled ministers of the standing order. As appears, partly, from Mr. B's own account, p. 85. where he tells us, that Mr. *John Cleaveland* was ordained by ministers of our denomination, over a church in part of *Ipswich*, " received " —into

" —into fellowſhip with the ſtanding churches." And by another hand I am aſſured, that " Mr. Ebenezer Cleveland was or-" dained at Cape Ann, over a regular ſociety, by regular mini-" ſters, and preaches there ſtill." So that my account of the ſeparate *teachers*, in the paſſage accuſed, viz. " that they have " none but unlearned men," holds true both at home and abroad.

And as to the other branch of the paſſage, viz " That they " don't uſe the means for obtaining any better accompliſhments," i. e. don't ſend their ſons to college, *with any view to qualify them for the work of the miniſtry, in their churches*, (which the argument that I was upon, muſt *neceſſarily imply*, this I ſay,) holds good in general, thro' all this part of the land: at leaſt for ought that Mr. B. has brought to diſprove it. For even in the inſtances which he mentions, it don't appear that any ſeparate parent, as *a ſeparate*, ever ſent his ſon to college, *with a view to qualify* him, (i. e. as to human learning,) for the miniſtry, *in the ſeparate way*; which to argue fairly, ought to come into the conſideration.

As to the *Cleavelands* above mentioned,—'Tis granted that Mr. *Joſiah Cleaveland*, (of the ſeparate church in *Canterbury*,) " ſent two of his ſons to college," as Mr. B. relates p. 42.—But then, he ſent them as one of the *ſtanding order*, long enough before he ſeparated.—For, as Mr. B. himſelf relates, (p. 66. bottom) " After they had been at college about three Years," (ſuppoſing them both to be of a claſs,) they " were both expelled out of " college"; which, (as p. 42. 43.) was on Nov. 19. 1744. for attending the *ſeparate* meeting at Canterbury, about two months before *that*. But there was no ſeparation at *Canterbury*. (if Mr. *Backus*, gives a true account of that matter,) until ſome time in the year 1744. For he tells us, p. 38. that " it *began* in this " manner;" that is, as he goes on to relate, was occaſioned by the calling and ſettling of Mr. *Cogſwell* there, which was in December 1744.—Which proves that Mr. *Joſiah Cleaveland* ſent his ſons to college years before he ſeparated.——And ſo he did not ſend them *as a ſeparate*, but as one of the ſtanding order.

The reader will judge now, whether it was fair and honeſt, in Mr. B. to bring the *Cleavelands*, as inſtances of the ſeparates ſending their ſons to college? " I leave Mr. B. to conſider how " he can anſwer what he has ſaid," &c.

In the ſame page Mr. B. tells of " *three* members of *one* ſepa-" rate church in Norwhich," ſending each a ſon to college within theſe few years: And *that* one ſeparate church is much on the decline, numbers having returned to the ſtanding church or ſociety there, and the *reſt* are without a *head*. The Rev. Mr. *Ful-*

ler,

ler, their late paſtor, having left them, and lately diſtinguiſhed himſelf, to the honour of truth and goſpel order, by a public reflection upon himſelf, (as I am credibly informed) for his error in promoting ſeparations from the ſtanding churches, ſo much as he has done. And was, ſome months ago, *ordained*, by regular miniſters, over a regular church and congregation, in *Plainfield*.

BUT as to the three ſons of *ſeparates*, above mentioned, at *Norwich*, who were lately brought up at the college, I am aſſured by an evidence before me, " that it was owing to the very great " deſire of the *ſons* rather than to the motion of their parents; " certainly ſo, as to *two* of them." Now that *theſe*, or any other inſtances, of ſeparates ſending their ſons to college, may really prove any thing to purpoſe, there ſhould be ſome evidence that they ſent them with a *view* to qualify them the *better* for the work of the miniſtry, *in their ſeparate churches*. Otherwiſe I think it fails of proving them *friends* to *learning*, in the ſenſe of the preſent queſtion.

ONE thing is remarkable, and, I think might well put the ſeparates upon ſerious reflection, that thoſe few young gentlemen, of a liberal education, whoſe parents are ſeparates, (at leaſt *all* that I am acquainted with,) are exceedingly griev'd at their parents ſeparation, and earneſtly labour to convince them of their miſtake,—are peculiarly attach'd to the ſtanding miniſters and churches; and, believe I may ſay, are the furtheſt remov'd from the ſeparate ſpirit, errors and ways.

MATTERS being thus, when ſet in their true light, ſufficiently prove that the ſeparates do, in general, ſet light by learning,—that they do not eſteem a liberal education, as a needful accompliſhment; at leaſt of any great *importance*, for the work of the miniſtry. They themſelves do know that they ſpeak lightly of it, and *practically* ſet it at naught, as the whole body of their *elders* loudly proclaim. And if they require any further evidence to the truth of what I have ſaid, upon the ſubject, let the ſpirit and language of Mr. *Backus*, ſhown throughout his book, againſt the learned *miniſtry* of the ſtanding churches, ſupply the place of many witneſſes.

I SHALL, here, only add a paſſage or two, inſtead of many, wherein Mr. B. miſtakes my ſermons, in his uſe of the word *church*, and *church of Chriſt*.—I have already ſhown that my book treats of the *church of Chriſt* in a large ſenſe, meaning his *viſible church* upon earth, conſiſting of all viſible believers, or profeſſors of the chriſtian faith, walking agreeable thereto, and *their children*.—But Mr. B. in his examination of my book, frequently,

if

if not generally, takes the word *church* in the moſt narrow and limited ſenſe, as intending only a number of *adult believers*, in *full communion*. As appears p. 19 top: his quotation from Dr. *Mather* and Mr. *Mitchel*. And p. 49. bottom. "When we "firſt appeared againſt having the worthy and unworthy partake "together at the *Lord's table*" &c. And p. 51. top, "The over-"enlarging of *full communion*" &c. And ſo throughout this part of his ſubject; and in numerous other places, he confronts me with a *church* that I was not ſpeaking about, i. e. not in that ſenſe. And ſo he often diſputes without an opponent.

THERE are many more inſtances in which Mr. B. has miſtaken the ſubject of my ſermons, both in reſpect to the *ſeparations* and *people* that I was ſpeaking of, and in reſpect to the *church* that I was characterizing. His miſtakes of theſe kinds, lie diſperſed throughout his book; which I cannot collect together, in this place. I ſhall notice them, as I meet with them, and refer them to this chapter; or the reader may note them himſelf, and by the ſpecimen that I have given, he will be able to clear many accuſed paſſages, in my ſermons, of the falſhood charged upon them.

WHAT has been ſaid is ſufficient to ſhow, that Mr. B. thro' his own miſtakes has frequently turn'd his readers attention from the object that I evidently had in view, and fix'd it upon ſomething foreign to the ſubject: Which occaſions him frequently to talk entirely beſide the purpoſe, in many parts of his book; as may be farther ſhown, in their proper places —— Thus having unhappily wandred out of his way, and not miſtruſting that he is loſt, but confident of his being right, he often faults his author where there is no error committed; and as frequently triumphs without a victory.

Chapter IV.

Remarks on the title page and preface of Mr. B's book.

HIS ſaying (title page) that I "labour to prove that the *ſe-*"*parates & baptiſts* are joining with the gates of hell againſt "them" (i. e. againſt the ſtanding churches, built upon the rock) is not ingenuouſly done, nor indeed *truly* repreſented.

I CANNOT, at preſent, find, nor do I remember more than two paſſages, in my ſermons, upon which he can found his charge. In my addreſs to my ſeparate and baptiſt brethren, preface, p. 7. top,

top, (which they might do well to read over again,) I [illegible]
" Think how displeasing it must be to our gracious God a[illegible]
" Redeemer, who *has purchased his church with his own blood*, [illegible]
" you *have taken part* with *the gates of hell*, in attempts to de[illegible]-
" lish the building; as I am *fully persuaded you* have done, tho[illegible]
" (I hope) *undesignedly*, thro' the *subtilty of that* old serpent, [illegible]
" *beguiled* our *innocent mother* "——And, speaking of the *Ba*[illegible]
churches, Sermon V. p. 95. I say, " They little think, *as I c*[illegible]-
" *ritably believe, how far* they join *with the gates of hell*, in op[illegible]-
" sing the church of Christ, by laying waste the nursery," &c[illegible]-
In both which passages the candid and judicious reader will o[illegible]-serve, that I gently touch their supposed error, in such a form of speech, as evidently carries a generous *apology* for them, at the same time that I remind them of the unchristian part which they are acting. And *this* is widely different from the light in which Mr. B. has set them, in his title page. Good men, thro' mistake, especially in the height of their zeal, may be said to join the gates of hell against Christ and his church; as Peter did in opposing his sufferings, Matth. 16. 22. *Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee.* For which he met with that sharp rebuke, ver. v. *Get thee behind me, satan,* &c.

His text, in title page, " Isa. 62. 10. *Go thro', go thro' the gates*, " *gather out the stones, lift up a standard for the people*," assigns a very difficult and important work, to some well accomplished reformer, to remove every impediment out of the way of God's people's embracing and adhering to his holy religion. And if the text has any reference to the book that Mr. B has printed against my sermons, I leave the judicious reader to say, whether he has skillfully and faithfully done the service; or whether he has not cast *twenty stones* at the *prophets* of the Lord, his *ministers*, to *one* that he has removed out of the way of *his people*? And Mr. B. himself might do well to consider seriously if it is not so.

His quotation from Dr. *Owen*, title page, bottom, " Separation " generally bears ill in the world, and yet there is a separation " suitable to the mind of God: he that will not separate from the " *world* and *false worship*, is a separate from Christ,"* is undoubtedly true, and makes directly *against* the people *for* whom Mr. B. is going to plead. That the separation of our brethren, from the *standing churches*, (if Mr. B intends *them*) is from the *world and from false worship*, and so, *suitable to the mind of God*, is the thing to be proved; and which Doctor *Owen* is so far from help-

 in

* Eschol, p. 36.

ing him to the proof of, or even intending, that he expresly denies it, and would highly resent the application of his words to favor so ill a design. For we must suppose the Doctor to understand himself, and to speak consistently. And he tells us, next page. (*Eschol*, p 37) 'That *causeless* separations from *established churches*, walking according to the *order* of the *gospel*, (though perhaps *failing* in the practice of some things of small concernment) *is no small sin*.' And immediately tells us what those separations are, which he justifies and accounts suitable to the mind of God, viz. 'separation from the *sinful practices*, and disorderly *walkings*, and *false unwarranted ways of worship* in any.' But *these* are offences, which our separate brethren, who had any tolerable degree of understanding, even in the height of their zeal, did not pretend to charge us with; or if they did, the charge could not be supported: Nay they themselves endeavor to imitate our worship. So that this passage from that eminent writer, stands, in the title page, as an empty sound of words, that do but amuse the less intelligent reader: or else they make nothing *for* our separates, but *against them*.

But to touch a little on the preface.——Mr B begins it with encomiums on *peace*, and speaking the *truth in love*. But who begun the strife, that unhappily commenced many years ago, and which has continued to this day? Did not the ministers of Christ promote and encourage the work of God, with all their might; even those very ministers where there have been the greatest separations? Did not the people—those that finally separated, take upon them the liberty to judge and censure the ministers, and many of their orderly brethren, as carnal men and hypocrites? for which and many other uncharitable and disorderly practices, the ministers, in faithfulness reproved them: which opened their mouth still wider against them. For *this*, and other instances of their *standing* by the cause of God and his truths, they were declared *opposers of the work of God*, and enemies to the cause of Christ. So that the breach of peace began on the separates side ——But where are the peace makers? Has Mr. B. *followed the things that make for peace*, in the spirit, language, or arguments of his book? Has he *spoken the truth in love*? Has he altered one sentence, about the standing ministers (some favorites excepted) that carries the least token of love, or decent respect? I will suppose he thinks that he has spoken the truth about them, (however mistaken) but where is the *love*, even the *love* that is due to an enemy? Verily, 'tis not to be found: but,

I am ſorry to ſay it, bitterneſs, clamour and evil ſpeaking, are the moſt diſtinguiſhing characters of his performance. So that when he ſpeaks of "*galling* one another in *perverſe diſputes*," (pref. p 1, bottom) he might well bluſh over his pen, and ſay 'I am the man.'

But paſſing over many things that are exceptionable in the preface, I would juſt remark on one or two more, and proceed to the body of his work.

Preface p 5, he obſerves, 'Mr. Fiſh tells us he hopes, if there 'be any miſtakes, it will be looked upon as ſimple and undeſign-'ed.' But ſays he, 'As he has miſtook the rule itſelf, thro'out 'his book, I leave him and others to conſider how ſimple and 'undeſigned ſuch a miſtake can be.' His argument here is this. If a man miſtakes the rule, it cannot be a ſimple, undeſigned miſtake: But Mr. F. has miſtaken the rule; therefore it cannot be a ſimple, undeſigned miſtake, i. e. he cannot be an honeſt man. The *conſequence* is denied, if the *fact* be true; unleſs we hold to the doctrine of perfection of heart.

But what *rule* does he here ſpeak of? '*The golden rule*,' ſays he below, i. e. the rule in Mat. 7 12. *All things whatſoever ye would that men ſhould do unto you do ye even ſo unto them*—as I ſuppoſe he muſt intend.

Three witneſſes are ſummoned, which he ſays avail in law, to prove that I have miſtaken the rule above. p. 5.

1ſt Witneſs. 'No man, ſays he, or community, can think it 'reaſonable, to have their character drawn, only by their imper-'fections, without any of their virtues: yet Mr. F. ſays, what-'ever good things they have among them, they have them not '*as ſeparates*, but in common with other chriſtians.'

Reply. It was not my proper buſineſs to draw their character as *men*, nor as *chriſtians*, but only *as ſeparates* (Sermons p 160) 'The things that I have told you of above, are their *characteriſ-'tics*, or their diſtinguiſhing marks *as ſeparates*,' (which Mr. B. leaves out); and whatever *virtues* they had *as men* or as *chriſtians*, (which I frequently allow them) yet I knew of none they had *as ſeparates* Therefore I had properly to do with nothing but their *imperfections*, errors, or faults. Theſe I had to deſcribe, reprove and correct. And ſo I acted agreeable to that *golden rule*, in telling them *of*, and reproving them *for* their *imperfections* and errors. For ſurely, that rule don't oblige us to tell a brother all his *good properties*, when we go to reprove him for his faults.

2d Witneſs.

2d Witneſs. 'None can be willing (ſays Mr. B.) to have the 'character of their whole denomination taken from evil perſons 'and things, which may be picked out among them: yet in the 'midſt of this labour to draw our picture, he ſays, 'I would not 'here be underſtood to repreſent them all, to a man, as advanc- 'cing and uniting in every one of the particulars above mention- 'ed; but ſome of them held one, ſome another,' p. 142.

Reply. The very quotation that Mr. B makes out of my book, ſhows that I was not giving the character of the *whole denomination*, but only of *individuals*. And if I have given *them* their true character, the ground of his complaint is removed, The *denomination* remains as it was.

And as to the '*evil perſons and things*,' which he ſuppoſes I have 'picked out,' I leave Mr. B. to ſettle that point with them; for thoſe that I ſpeak of, were, chiefly, ſuch as paſſed for *good* perſons, in that day; and the *things* that I relate, are *ſuch things* as they *aid* and *did*, which they held for *truths*: and if they were *evil*, Mr. B. muſt labour to confute them, if I have not done it.

But I have ſhown that my ſermons treat of the *ſeparates at home*, and touch none abroad, but ſuch as are like them: ſo, the *whole denomination* is out of the queſtion.

3d Witneſs. 'No man can be rationally willing to be deprived 'of the liberty of hearing and judging for himſelf, in important 'matters; nor to be condemned by others without a fair hearing. 'Yet—Mr. Fiſh's—ſpecial article of advice, in the concluſion is; 'Go not after them nor follow them.'—'Thus his whole drift 'appears to be, to keep his people from hearing and judging for 'themſelves. And he has condemned us without a fair hearing.' p. 5, 6.

Reply. I ſhould be very ſorry if I had done any thing to deprive men of their natural right, to hear and judge for themſelves. Surely I have taught the contrary, in my book, p. 76. top, 'Every man muſt ſee, and think, and judge for himſelf,' and ſame p. bottom, 'Each one muſt judge, believe and chuſe for 'himſelf, in the affairs of religion.' And I endeavored to aſſiſt my people, to whom thoſe ſermons were preached, to exerciſe their chriſtian liberty aright; by laying ſcripture truths before them, with all plainneſs; ſhewing them the errors of their ſeparate brethren, and laying open the ſin and danger of their ways. In all which there was light held up, and (as I apprehend) matter of judgment offered for them to act upon. Now, as I was then ſpeaking to my *own* people, who are *not ſeparates*, it

was

was surely the part of a faithful shepherd, to warn his flock of their danger; and perfectly consistent with *liberty* to advise, 'Go 'not after them, nor follow them,' unless *advice* and *liberty* are inconsistent. And as to the *separates*, my people were well acquainted with them, they were bred among them, and needed not to go after them in order to inform themselves: they well knew their *principles*, *spirit* and *ways*, from what they had heard in public as well as from personal acquaintance. And if they needed any farther light, they might gain it, by reading the books that Mr. B. says, have been written on both sides of the question. So that *my people* had full liberty of 'hearing and judging for 'themselves.

And as to the *separates* being 'condemned without a fair hear-'ing,' as Mr. B. charges me, this is not true *of my own parishion-ers*, who are the *only people* we have to do with in *this place*. For *my separate brethren*, besides the advantage of all public and private means, before they left my ministry, had afterwards as fair an opportunity as they could desire, to offer their *reasons* for *separation*; and full liberty to say what they pleased *to* us, and they *did* say what they pleased *of* us, for four or five hours together, at a church meeting appointed *wholly* upon their account. And after the church had formed a judgment upon those *reasons*, we sent a request to our *separate* brethren, earnestly desiring them to attend the next *church meeting*, to offer them all the light we could, and to hear if they had any thing further to say. But they utterly refused to come; as related in my book, p. 146. The church then sent a committee with the pastor, to their houses, to *help* them to matters of conviction. *Some* received our visit and conversation, together with the church's judgment, *civilly*; but *others* would not. So that *my people* that separated, had as full and fair a hearing (if they had pleased *fairly* to have attended to it) as ever people had. Therefore *they* were not condemned *without* a hearing, as Mr. B. wrongfully charges.—As for *strangers*, Mr. *Backus*, and the whole *fraternity of separates*, properly understood by the relative US—('He has condemned US,' says Mr. B.) *they* were out of my jurisdiction. I had no business to call *them* to a hearing; and *they* are entirely out of the present question.

Thus I think Mr. B's *three witnesses*, upon which he confidently relied to gain his cause, have utterly failed him. Their *number* indeed is sufficient, in law, to have convicted me of mistaking the *rule*: but their evidence cannot be legally admitted, for want of truth and common sense.

I have to acknowlege his apology for me, preface, p. 6. 'I 'ſuppoſe (ſays he) the chief thing which *blinded* him, in theſe 'affairs was a *conceit* of his good deſign therein.'—Now 'tis no 'new thing (he adds) for men under a *ſtrong conceit* that they are 'engaged in a good cauſe, to put good meanings to bad actions of 'their own, and bad meanings to good actions of others.' And I return the charitable ſuppoſition, that Mr. B. *conceited* that he had a *good deſign* in writing his piece. And if men's eyes may be blinded by ſuch a *conceit*, then he has given, at leaſt, one true reaſon of his own *blindneſs*, in a great part of the reaſonings and charges of *his* book againſt *mine*.

If what I have ſaid of *my ſeparate brethren*, is as far from truth as what the *Biſhop* of *Glouceſter*, in his ſermon before the Society, ſays of the coloniſts, then there was ſome propriety in his applying the injurious reflections of that author, as a reproof to me: but as Mr. B. neither has, nor, I truſt, ever can prove that I have injuriouſly miſrepreſented *my brethren*, I ſhall therefore paſs over all that he has quoted from the biſhop, with his remarks upon it, in pref. p. 7, 8, 9, as not to the purpoſe: and ſhall only anſwer his enquiry, pref. p. 9. 'Who is this that preſumes to correct '*biſhops* and *miniſters* at ſuch a rate?' Anſ Perhaps we ſhall find him pointed out, Luke 14. 28 *One that intending to build a tower did not ſit down firſt to count the coſt, whether he had ſufficient to finiſh it.* What follows in the next verſe, is left to the reader.

Pref. p. 10. 'I would be far (ſays Mr. B.) from repreſenting 'Mr. F. as *ſingular* in what he has publiſhed. No; his ſermons 'are a *ſpecimen* of what has often been delivered from pulpits in 'our land, for more than 20 years.'—— Tis likely ſo—and is a proof that the ſame ſpirit and errors of the ſeparates, which my ſermons ſpeak againſt, have prevalled elſewhere in the land: For none can ſuppoſe that the miniſters would have preached againſt what had no exiſtence among them. And Mr. B. might well be check'd and put upon ſerious reflection, when he finds that thoſe pious and great men, Mr. *Edwards*, and Mr. *D. Brainard*, (highly eſteemed by Mr. B.) were as pungent, if not as frequent, in declaring againſt the ſeparates and their errors, as I and my brethren have been. See Mr. Edwards's Religious Affections thro'out, and p. 25. alſo Mr. Brainard's Life, particularly p. 226, to 229. and p. 291, 292; alſo Mr. Edwards's Funeral Sermon for Mr. Brainard, p. 30.

Chapter

Chapter V.

Mr. B's miſtakes about A church, and lineal ſucceſſion, corrected: and his notion of the new covenant, from Jer. 31. 31. (to ſhut out infants of believers) confuted.

P. 11, title—'Characters which Mr. F. gives of *A* church of 'Chriſt.'—His ſaying *A* church, intimates that I had been giving the character of a *particular* church of *communicants*; in which ſenſe I find he frequently takes up the word *church* in my book; which I have ſhown is not the ſubject of my diſcourſes about *the church of Chriſt*: and ſo he *ſets out* with a miſtake.

P. idem. 'Thoſe who deſire to bring any controverſy to a juſt 'iſſue, will endeavor to hold up what light they can, concerning 'the *merits of the cauſe*, and not amuſe or perplex others minds 'with things foreign from the things in hand.'

The *thought* is good; and if his *practice* had been agreeable, my work would have been eaſy—The reader will judge if many things are not *foreign*.

P. 14. 'Why was his memory ſo ſhort, as never to mention 'the *prophets* in the Jewiſh church, while he enlarges upon the '*prieſts* and *Levites*?'——Reply. The prophets were *extraordinary* miniſters, raiſed up and ſent with ſpecial meſſages; and had not their ſtated, daily ſervices, as the prieſts and Levites had. *Theſe* were the ordinary ſtanding miniſters in the church of God in that day: and of ſuch *officers* I meant to ſpeak——He adds, 'Perhaps he might think the *latter*' (the prieſts and Levites) 'would beſt agree with his notion of a *line of ſucceſſion*;'—and a little below calls it 'an uninterrupted line down from the 'apoſtles.'

Mr. B. has not told us where that *notion* of *mine* is advanced, in my book; neither do I remember one paſſage that ſpeaks any ſuch thing.—I have ſaid indeed, p. 18, that 'even for that thou-'ſand years, in which popery over-run the chriſtian world, the 'church was well ſupplied with *ſound, learned* and godly mini-'ſters, who boldly defended the truths of God againſt the man 'of ſin; even until the glorious reformation under *Luther* and '*Calvin*' And I add, 'This we are aſſured off from *hiſtory* of 'undoubted authority, where the very names of thoſe *able mini-'ſters* are preſerved.'———This, it ſeems, Mr. B. underſtands to contain 'my notion of a *line* of *ſucceſſion*,' as above—For he adds,

adds, p. 14, 'He would have us think that they have such a 'regiſter, where the *very names* of ſuch a line is preſerved. But 'it ſeems by the margin that 'tis in *Latin*, and as we are come out 'of the Latin church, we ſhall expect to hear it in *Engliſh*, before 'we believe it.'

Reply. My authority for the above, is an old book, entitled, *Jus Divinum*, (as margin) at large, '*Jus Divinum Miniſterii Evangelici*;' in Engliſh, '*The Divine Right of the Goſpel Miniſtry*;' 'publiſhed by the Provincial Aſſembly of London, 1654, and 'ſubſcribed in the Name and by the Appointment of the Aſſem-'bly Nov. 2. 1653, *Roger Drake, Moderator, Matthew Peel, Scribe*,' and others.

And now Mr. B. has it *in Engliſh*, I hope that he and his brethren *will believe* what I have ſaid above, If I can ſhew, from this indiſputable authority, that the church has been thus furniſhed with ſuch miniſters as above, even in the darkeſt times. Chap. 3. p. 53. 'From the time of Chriſt and his apoſtles, for 600 'years, our famous *Jewel* againſt the Romaniſts, hath abundant-'ly proved, that the *truths* profeſſed in the reformed churches, 'were maintained by the *antients*. And in the ſucceeding cen-'turies, when the man of ſin began to prevail, there were, in 'their ſeveral ages, *godly and learned miniſters*, who oppoſed the 'popiſh errors, defending the ſufficiency of ſcripture, communion 'in both kinds, juſtification by free grace, diſclaiming the defile-'ments of worſhip, in adoring images, invocation of ſaints, pray-'ing for the dead, worſhiping reliques; and openly teſtifying 'againſt the riſing and ſwelling power of the *Pope*, declaring 'againſt his ſupremacy and title of univerſal Biſhop, as antichri-'ſtian.'

Their names are as follows:

'From the 600th year of Chriſt to the 700th, beſides *Iſidore*, '*Heſychius*, and others, there were alſo in this iſland' (England) 'thoſe two famous preachers *Aidan*—and alſo *Firan*,' eminently ſucceſsful in turning to the chriſtian faith the kingdoms of *Northumberland* and the Eaſt *Saxons*.

8th Century, 'Beſides our famous countrymen *Bede*, *Alcuinus*, 'and many others, there were *Aldebertus* and *Clemens* and *Samſon*, 'with many other *prieſts*, who did mightily withſtand Pope '*Boniface*.'

9th Century, were '*Taurienſis*, *Agobardus*, *Rabanus*, and *Scotus*; 'the *laſt* accuſed by the *Pope* for an heretick.'

10th Century, '*Rodulphus* and others.'

11th

11th Century, 'In the heat and height of *antichriſtianiſm*, *Fulbert*, biſhop of *Chartres*, and many more.'

12th Century, 'Beſides *Arnalphus* the martyr, *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, &c. were *Peter Bruis* and his ſcholar *Henry* of *Tholouſe*, two famous preachers againſt popiſh errors.

13th Century, 'In this age are recorded *Altiſſiodore*, *Peter de Vineis*, &c. and thoſe two famous preachers *Gerardus* and *Dulcinus*, who preached that the *Pope* was *Antichriſt*, and *Rome Babylon*.'

14th Century, 'In this age appeared for Chriſt *Thomas Bradwarden*, *Richard Armachanus*, *Taulerus*, a famous preacher in *Germany*, and that glorious inſtrument of the Lord, *John Wickliff*.'

15th Century, '*Savanorola*, *John Huſs*,' &c.

16th Century. '*Martin Luther*, and many others.'

And thus our Lord has fulfilled, in his providence, what he promiſed in his word, *Lo I am with you alway unto the end of the world*; neceſſarily implying that there would be *miniſters* in his church for him to be preſent with. So evident is it that the church of God has been ſupplied with able and faithful miniſters, and that he has taken care to preſerve and hand down their *names* thro' every age of the church.

Thus I have made it appear, by the beſt kind of proof the ſubject would admit of, next to the promiſe itſelf, even *the moſt credible hiſtory*, that the church of Chriſt has always been furniſhed with faithful and accompliſhed miniſters; which was all that I had to defend; for this was all that I ſaid.——A *lineal ſucceſſion* of *miniſters* from the apoſtles, is *one thing*, which I did not aſſert; and a *conſtant ſupply* of *miniſters* in the church, which I have proved, is *another thing*, which Mr. B. ought to have known how to diſtinguiſh, before he determined to reject my account, as altogether *fabulous*; miſapplying, and, by miſapplication, *abuſing* 1 Tim. 1. 4. *Neither give heed to fables*, &c.

But that which is of the greateſt importance, in theſe pages of Mr. B. is about the *materials* of the viſible chriſtian church. In p. 22. of my ſermons, I obſerve, 'that the church of Chriſt,' (i. e. His viſible church upon earth, before deſcribed) 'has always 'conſiſted of viſible believing parents and their children, bound 'together by covenant to be the Lord's.'—And having ſhown that the viſible church of God has all along been made up of *ſuch materials*, i. e. *believing parents* and *their children*, from the beginning, and particularly from Abraham's day, with whom God

moſt explicitly renewed his gracious covenant, taking in his ſeed, I aſk p. 27. 'Is it not altogether reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the 'chriſtian church is made up of the *ſame materials* that the Jew-'iſh church was?"

Mr. B. p. 12, grants, "'Tis true that this was the conſtitution 'of the church which was gathered in *Abraham's* family;' but with reſpect to the *materials* of the *chriſtian* church, he ſays, in anſwer to my enquiry above, 'No, by no means; becauſe God 'has ſaid the contrary.—And to prove that he has ſaid ſo, quotes 'Jer. 31. 31, 32. *Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, that I will 'make a new covenant with the houſe of Iſrael, and with the houſe of 'Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers 'in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the 'land of Egypt.*—Thoſe that ſtood forth then, as a body to enter 'into covenant, tho' they had ſeen great ſigns and miracles, yet 'the Lord had not given them a *heart to perceive, eyes to ſee*, nor '*ears* to *hear* unto that day. But of this new covenant he ſays, 'I will put my law in their *inward parts*, and write it *in their 'hearts*, and I *will* be their God, and they *ſhall* be my people, 'and *they ſhall all know me*, &c. v. 33. The conſtitution prieſt-'hood and ordinances of the Jewiſh church ſerved unto the *ex-'ample* and *ſhadow* of heavenly things; but this is a *better* cove-'nant which is eſtabliſhed upon *better promiſes*. That *old* cove-'nant Iſrael *break*, and he *regarded them not*: but this *new* cove-'nant is eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes, which are, *I will*, and '*they ſhall*, Heb. 8.—5—13.' And hereupon he concludes p. 13. 'I cannot imagine that tis poſſible for words to expreſs more 'plainly than theſe do, that there is an *eſſential* difference between 'the *materials* as well as the *forms* of the two churches——All 'Abraham's natural ſeed were circumciſed: and God ſaid, *My 'covenant ſhall be in your fleſh*: and all his ſeed in a *moſtel* ſenſe 'have the law written in their *hearts*, and their *ſins* ſhall be *re-'membered no more*, Heb. 10. 16, 17. Accordingly it was ſuch—'*as ſhould be ſaved*, that were *added to the church* in the apoſtles 'times, Acts 2. And when ſome of a *contrary character*' (i. e. ſuch as *ſhould not be ſaved*) 'got in,' (i. e. into the church, made up of ſuch as *ſhould* be *ſaved*) 'they are ſaid to *creep in unawares*, 'Gal. 2. 4. Jude 4. Therefore I think we may juſtly return 'our author's queſtion, and ſay, is it not altogether *unreaſonable* 'to ſuppoſe that the chriſtian church is made up of the *ſame ma-'terials* the Jewiſh church was, ſince the Holy Ghoſt has ſo 'plainly declared the contrary?'——This being a point of

very

very great importance, I have given the *whole* of his reasoning upon it, and almost *every word*, that it may be seen whether I take Mr. B. right, and treat him fairly.

To which I reply, If I understand him, I think his meaning must be this, That the covenant which God made with Israel when he brought them up out of Egypt, was *the covenant* which took in *parents* and *children*, and made them the *materials* of the Jewish church: but the *new covenant*, which he *would* make with them afterwards, is *essentially* different from *that* covenant; and therefore there must be an *essential* difference in the materials of the two churches, *Jewish* and *Christian*—That in fact the materials of the christian *visible* church (I say *visible*, for *that* is our subject) are all truly gracious persons: for he says, 'the *law* is 'written in their hearts, their *sins are pardoned*, and they are such 'as *shall* be saved: and consequently there is an end to the distinction between *visible* and *invisible*—And yet tis so that *hypocrites* do sometimes creep in, i. e. into the church which he had just described ——These I think are his sentiments, so far as I can see any thing of his meaning. The *last* appears to be a manifest absurdity; for it supposes that *bad* men may creep into a church where there are *none* but *good men*.—The two first, I think, are very gross mistakes, which being laid in the foundation of his work, have led him astray in *those points* thro' the whole.

To shew his mistake about the covenant Jeremiah speaks of, and to confirm what I advanced about the materials of the Christian visible church, I shall attempt the following points,

1. Open the covenant which God made with his people Israel, when he bro't them up out of the land of Egypt; and shew, that altho' the *new* covenant here spoken of, is not according to *that*, yet that tis the same, for substance, with the *covenant of grace* made with Abraham, which took in children with their parents, making them the materials of the visible church.

2. That there is therefore nothing in the constitution of this new covenant, that *necessarily* requires a change of the materials of the church that is formed under it.

3. That the Christian dispensation of this new covenant, preserves the same materials, for kind, as the Jewish had.

4. And therefore that God has not, in his word said any thing *contrary* to what I have laid down.

FIRST, *Open the covenant which God made with his people Israel, when he bro't them up out of the land of Egypt*, &c.

This is doubtless the law or *covenant* which God gave them by

by Moſes, at Mount *Sinai* ſoon after they came out of Egypt; which, as to the *matter* and *form* of it, conſidered ſimply by itſelf, is diſtinguiſhed from the covenant of grace, which God made with Abraham long before, as I think is clear from Gal 4 where St. Paul, ſpeaking of Abraham's two ſons *Iſhmael* and *Iſaac*, the former by *Hagar* the bond woman, the latter by *Sarah* the free-woman and by *promiſe*, v. 22 23 adds v. 24 These things are an allegory For *theſe are the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar*: The *other* (as muſt be underſtood) from mount *Sion*, which is *Sarah*, by whom Abraham had his other ſon, *Iſaac*, according to *promiſe*; and ſignifies the *other covenant* that Paul ſpeaks of, i. e. the covenant of *grace*, with *Abraham*

This covenant at *Sinai*, which God made with Iſrael ſoon after they came out of Egypt, contained a ſyſtem of *moral*, *ceremonial* and *political* laws, for the regulation of their whole conduct.

The moral law, ſummed up in ten commandments, was not peculiar to the Sinai covenant; but always run thro' all the diſpenſations of the covenant of grace, as neceſſarily reſulting from the nature and perfections of God, and our relation to him and to one another;—always 'abides in force, and is by no means 'aboliſhed.'*

This Sinai covenant alſo contained a multitude of emblems or ceremonies, *which ſtood in meats and drinks and divers waſhings*, together with *ſacrifices and continual burnt offerings*, as types and figures of the Meſſiah, and the bleſſings of his kingdom.

There were moreover in it a number of laws for the regulation of the ſtate, or civil affairs; to guard the lives and properties of the people

Theſe things were ſhown to Moſes in the Mount, and by him delivered to the people, as the laws and commands of God; to which *they anſwered with one voice, and ſaid, All the words which the Lord hath ſaid, will we do, Exod* 24. 3. And ſo it was a proper formal covenant.

With regard to their civil ſtate, 'It was made only between 'God as their *political head* or *king of that people*, and the *Jews* as 'his national ſubjects; or at moſt, but as ſitting on the mercy 'ſeat, on a cloud of glory, as the viſible head of a national viſible 'church, and not deſigned to reach to the concerns of another 'world.'†

But more eſpecially are we to view God as their *political* head, in this covenant, and the people (the Jewiſh nation, thereby formed

* Harmony of Religions, p. 15. † P. 42.

formed into a civil *polity*) as is implied 1 Sam. 8. 5, 7. When the elders of Iſrael ſaid to Samuel, *Make us a king to judge us like all the nations:* The Lord ſaid—they have not rejected thee, *but they have rejected me, that I ſhould not reign over them.*

This Sinai covenant, conſidered ſeparately and apart by itſelf, was 'really, in the nature of it, a' (kind of) 'covenant of works;' as appears from hence, that their obedience to it ſecured them of their lives, properties and comforts, Deut. 6. 24, 25. *The Lord commanded us to do all theſe ſtatutes----that he might preſerve us alive, as at this day. And it ſhall be our righteouſneſs, if we obſerve to do all theſe commandments before the Lord our God.* And hence the carnal Jews fondly ſought to be juſtified before God, in matters pertaining to the conſcience and eternal life, by their obedience to the Sinai covenant; which great miſtake the apoſtle Paul endeavors abundantly to convince them of, and warn them againſt.

But *this covenant* was never deſigned to provide them with a juſtifying righteouſneſs before God, as to their eternal ſtate; neither was it capable of it. Their ſtricteſt obſervance of all the ſacrifices, waſhings and ceremonies of it, *could not make him that did the ſervice perfect, as pertaining to the conſcience*, Heb. 9. 9 —— The tranſgreſſor, after all the ſacrifices and purifications of the tabernacle, remained a guilty condemned creature before God, until he repaired to the covenant of grace for pardon and peace with God and his own conſcience, thro' the blood and righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt, Heb. 9. 14, 15. *For* (as Paul reaſons Gal. 3. 21) *if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteouſneſs ſhould have been by the law.*—— All the faithful, during the Sinai covenant, or under the *Moſaical* diſpenſation, were ſaved by faith in the pardoning mercy and grace of God, thro' the atoning blood of Jeſus Chriſt, as exhibited in the covenant of grace; as really and as fully as before or ſince. Accordingly *the goſpel was preached unto them as well as to us*, as we are told expreſly, Heb. 4. 2. It was *preached to Abraham*, as the apoſtle obſerves Gal. 3. 8. And it continued to be preached to his poſterity, the Iſraelites, as we ſee above, in Heb. 4. 2. Surely then they had the covenant of grace, at the ſame time that the Sinai covenant was in force.

Abraham's covenant was a pure covenant of grace, in which God promiſes, *I will be a God unto thee and to thy ſeed.* And again Gen. 28. 14. *In thee and in thy ſeed ſhall all the families of the earth be bleſſed.* Which the apoſtle to the Galatians improves, to cure them

† Harmony of Religions, p. 40.

them of their folly in depending on the works of the law to justify or make them perfect; and to convince them that *Christ* and *his grace* were the blessings contained in the promise of God to Abraham, that they might seek justification by faith in him alone, Gal. 3. 16. *Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made: he saith not, and to seeds as of many; but as of one; and to thy seed which is Christ* ——Surely then Abraham's seed, the Israelites at Sinai, or under that dispensation, were not justified and saved by the works of the law, but by faith in Christ. So then this covenant of grace, which runs thro' every dispensation, is the covenant which the Israelites were under and saved by, at the giving of the law, or covenant of Sinai; and ever after, even as tho' the *law* had never been given.—The Sinai covenant made not the least alteration in the covenant of grace, nor did it remove the people of God from under its blessed influence, and hope of salvation by it, any more than if the law of ceremonies had never been enacted: as the apostle expressly declares (in the next v. Gal. 3. 17.) *And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ,* (i.e. the covenant with Abraham) *the law* (i.e. the Sinai covenant) *which was 430 years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of no effect.* The promise of God to Abraham and his seed, i.e. the covenant of grace, stood firm and unchangeable, notwithstanding the law or covenant at Sinai: for it was confirmed by an oath. Heb. 6. 13, 14. *For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater he swear by himself, saying, surely blessing I will bless thee, &c.* alluding to Gen. 22. 16—18. *By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord - that in blessing I will bless thee - and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.*

Objection, But if the children of Israel were under the covenant of grace, *at* and *after* the giving of the law, to what end was it given? Gal. 3. 19. *Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added* (says Paul) *because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.*

It was *added*—The Greek word signifies, 'it was *put to*, not *set up*, itself alone, as a *distinct covenant*; but *added* as an *appendix* 'to the *covenant of grace*: whence it is plain that God added the 'Sinai law to the *promise*, for *evangelical ends* and *purposes*.'——Added—not set up in *opposition* to the promise, Gal. 3. 21. *Is the law then against the promise of God? God forbid.* This would have 'utterly disannulled the promise, v. 18. *for if the inheritance be of 'the law, 'tis no more by promise.*'

So

[a] Mr. *Flavel*, vol. 2. p. 443.

So that although the law or covenant of Sinai, considered by itself alone, may be called a *covenant of works* (as before noted); and hence the apostle calls it *the law*; and the people of God, during *that* dispensation, were said to be *under the law*; and the carnal Jews, thro' a very dangerous mistake, sought after righteousness by the works of the law, to justify them before God: yet this Sinai covenant, considered as an *appendix* to the *promise*, or *covenant of grace*, (*which* the people of God have always been under, since the fall of Adam) which is its proper place, and the light in which we should always view it;—full of emblems, figures and types, that evidently pointed to Christ, and the blessings of the covenant thro' him:—*And so*, it serves to many excellent and gracious purposes. So that, taking the *whole* of the Jewish dispensation together, tis plainly a dispensation of grace—a new *edition* of God's *gracious covenant* by *Moses*, and the *fourth* from *Adam*.

It being thus evident that the *Abrahamical* covenant, or covenant of grace, remained *the same* under the *Sinai* covenant—(for *this* called *the law*, the apostle assures us, could not disannul *that*) we are hereby led very easily to see the meaning of Jeremiah, in the text under consideration——Jer. 31. 31 &c. *The days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers*, &c.

A new covenant—that is, it shall not be according to the covenant or law given at *Sinai*; but entirely *new*, of a quite different construction, in respect to *that*. Indeed what was purely *moral* in that covenant, shall remain, as before noted: but as to the ceremonial and political laws of it, these shall cease, and the covenant shall be *new*.

But not *new* in respect to the *covenant of grace* made with *Abraham*. That runs to *him* and to *his seed* forever; that is, thro' all dispensations, invariably the same, as to the substance of it; and nothing *new* in it, only a new and fairer *edition*, under a new dispensation; and so, not *essentially* but only *circumstantially* different.

Now, altho' the Sinai covenant did not *exclude* children, yet it was not the Mosaical dispensation or covenant at Sinai; but the dispensation of the covenant of *grace* with *Abraham*, that renewedly took in parents and children together, as the materials of the visible church. God said to Abraham, *I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed*: and in token of it he gave the seal of the covenant

venant to *him* and to his *infant children*; and ſo formed a viſible church in his houſe. Mr. B. grants that 'this was the conſtitu-'tion of the church gathered in Abraham's family.' Which *promiſe* or covenant, with infant childrens privilege in it, continued from Abraham to Moſes, and run thro' the whole Jewiſh diſpenſation, to the coming of Chriſt.——The law or covenant which God made with Iſrael at *Sinai*, ſtrictly ſpeaking, had no hand in bringing in the *little ones* with *their parents*. Theſe materials of the church were gathered and eſtabliſhed 430 years before *this*. The *Sinai covenant found* them in the church—fixed *there* by the promiſe of God to their father Abraham; even by his covenant of *grace* with him; and had no power to caſt them out: for it *could not diſannul the promiſe*. All it could do was to adminiſter the laws, with the bleſſings and curſes which it contained, to the whole community, or church that was gathered by a better and more durable covenant.

Now when the *Sinai* diſpenſation ends—when the laws and ordinances of it are repealed, and a new diſpenſation of the covenant of grace (as the new covenant ſpoken of in the prophecy of Jeremiah evidently is) ſhall take place; all which was fulfilled at the coming of Chriſt, i. e after his death and reſurrection. how ſhall this event make any alteration in the *materials* of the church that were appointed and gathered under the *ſame covenant*, that is then to be made *new*, i. e. ſet forth under a *new diſpenſation*? Since 'twas by the covenant of grace that infants were taken in, with their parents, they muſt certainly hold their privilege—their place in the covenant and church, ſo long as the ſame covenant that took them in remains in force; unleſs by ſome ſpecial act of God, who made the covenant, their privilege is taken away; which is not to be produced.

Here then appears the *fatal* miſtake of Mr. B——*fatal* to his cauſe.

For I think it is evident, that he goes upon the ſuppoſition, that the covenant which God made with their fathers, the Iſraelites, when he took them by the hand and brought them out of of Egypt, (which muſt be the law or covenant of *Sinai*) is the covenant which gave children their church privileges. And therefore *that* being diſſolved, and the *new covenant* of Jeremiah, being not according to *that*, but quite a *new* and *another* thing, muſt have a new ſet of *materials*, ſubjects or members, to form a church of, under it. For there muſt be none in it, he ſays, but what have the *law written in their hearts*. Whereas I think it

has been proved, that the *children* of the *Jewiſh church*, were not admitted to privilege, by virtue of the covenant at *Sinai*, which covenant they break; but by the covenant of grace made with Abraham; in which God ſays, '*I will be a God unto thee and* '*to thy ſeed.*'—And therefore, tho' the covenant of Sinai be aboliſhed, and a new covenant made, yet this can never affect the materials of the church, or make any alteration in them; unleſs the new covenant that is to be made, be eſſentially different from that covenant which took them in, But *this* is for ſubſtance the ſame as hath been ſhown, and may be further cleared.

In a word, Mr B. relies wholly on the abolition of the *old*, or *Sinai* covenant; which neither took in, nor caſt out the children, and which we don't found our infants right upon; and on the making of a *new covenant*, which is, *ſubſtantially*, the very ſame that firſt took children into the church: and from hence concludes, that becauſe *a* covenant, which is entirely out of the queſtion, is aboliſhed, therefore the children muſt be denied privilege, in the chriſtian church, gathered under the ſame covenant that made them members at firſt;—which every one, of a common capacity, muſt ſee is falſe reaſoning. The conſequence is falſe, and the whole argument nothing to the purpoſe—The foundation being laid in ſand—an evident miſtake, the whole building falls.

I might here cloſe; but to give further light, for the ſatisfaction of all, that Jeremiah's *new covenant* is ſubſtantially the ſame covenant of grace made with Abraham, which took in children with their parents—the ſame that God's people have always been under, thro' all diſpenſations, ſince the fall, (to make this ſtill plainer) I ſhall add ſome paſſages of ſcripture.——Speaking to the ſame people that were under the *Sinai* covenant. God ſays, Deut. 30. 6, 8 *The Lord thy God ſhall circumciſe thine heart, and the heart of thy ſeed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, &c. and thou ſhalt return and obey the voice of the Lord, to do all his commandments, &c.*—the ſame thing as *writing the Law in their hearts*, in Jeremiah's new covenant;—and v. 11—14. *This commandment which I command thee this day, is not hidden from thee, &c. but the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, &c* q. d. Thou knoweſt and believeſt it.——The apoſtle interprets theſe paſſages, as intending the *righteouſneſs of faith*, Rom. 10 6—8. *Say not who ſhall aſcend, &c. the word is nigh, &c. that is, the word of faith which we preach.* The prophet Jeremiah adds, 33 v. *I* WILL *be their God, and they* SHALL *be my people.*

The same, in substance, with God's promise to Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. *I* WILL *establish my covenant between me and thee—to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.—A God unto thee and to thy seed*, is the covenant of grace, in full extent: 'Here is a con-'fluence of all blessings, temporal, spiritual and eternal.' Psal. 144. 15. *Happy is that people whose God is the Lord.*—God ours! all is *ours*. The covenant that has *this*, has all;—tis *full* of *grace*.—Upon Israel's entering Canaan, the covenant or promise runs thus, Lev. 26. 11—13. *I will set my tabernacle among you, and I will walk among you, and* WILL *be your God, and ye* SHALL *be my people; I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt.* Here is Jeremiah's *new covenant promise*, given in the same words, to the same people that came out of Egypt, while in the wilderness, to be made good to them in Canaan: and applied, by the apostle, to gospel times, under the new dispensation of the covenant of grace, to which Jeremiah refers, 2 Cor. 6. 16. *Ye are the temple of the living God: As God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them, and I will be their God and they shall be my people;* quoting the very words of Moses in Leviticus, spoken to Israel long before Jeremiah. Had not Israel then, the same new covenant of grace which Jeremiah speaks of? Where is the difference? I WILL and you SHALL, was ever the gracious word of God, or form of his *covenant* of grace—How then 'is it 'a *better covenant*, established upon *better promises?*' as Mr. B. argues. 'Tis *better* than the *Sinai* covenant; but not *better* than the covenant of *grace* with *Adam*, *Noah*, *Abraham* and *Israel*; for it is *essentially* the same; only at the time Jeremiah speaks of, it would receive the fairest edition that ever it had; and its rich contents would be more fully opened. The prophet adds, v. 34. *They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, saying, know the Lord; for they shall all know me*, &c—To be understood in a qualified sense. To be sure, *knowlege* shall be greatly increased in gospel times. When the prophecies are opened and read in the history, people of every age and rank shall be more universally acquainted with Christ and gospel truths. The gospel shall be sent to the Gentiles, and they shall be turned *from darkness to light*. The holy Spirit shall be poured out, and multitudes shall be converted, and their sins shall be forgiven.—But all this don't prove it a *new covenant*, in the sense of Mr. B. *These*, and all other blessings were put into the covenant of *grace*, when it was first made; and a measure of them was dispensed to the patriarchs

and

and to all the faithful, from the beginning. In gospel times, the blessings of this *new covenant* were to issue forth more abundantly, according to the prophet.

The Jews had an *earnest* of the rich inheritance---of these *new* covenant blessings, when they returned from the Babylonish captivity. Then was fulfilled the like promise of God by Ezekiel 36. 26---28. *I will take away the stoney heart, says God, out of your flesh, &c. and put my Spirit within you----And ye* SHALL *be* MY PEOPLE, *and I* WILL *be* YOUR GOD. The same again as this in Jeremiah. And thus it was---God made that people of such a temper, at least, remarkably so, as he had promised.——And in the latter days, the glory of which is yet to come, the inexhaustible treasures of this new covenant blessings shall be poured out more abundantly than ever before; *when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ.*

Objection. But how is this covenant NEW, if it be the same for substance that it always was? Can the same thing be *old* and *new*, too?

Answer. In different respects it may. John 13. 34. *A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another.*—*This*, in itself, is an *old* commandment, Levit. 19. 18. *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.* And yet *new*, as our Lord taught it more *plainly* than ever; pressed it by *new motives*, and above all recommended it by a *new example*, even *his own*; adding, *as I have loved you*—He laid down his life for them. So 1 John 3. 16. *We ought to lay down our lives for the brethren*, for the christian community, church and cause of Christ: and so *new*, as to the extent and degree of its operation.

Thus the *covenant* of *grace* is here called *new*; not only in respect to the *Sinai* covenant, as before noted, but in respect to itself—*essentially* the same—*I your God, and you my people----Justified freely by his grace*---through *faith in his blood*, Rom. 3. 24, 25. Always the *same*, in such respects; but *circumstantially new*---- The *gospel dispensation* of it is new; different from any that had been before it--more spiritual, simple, and free from outward ceremonies. *New*, as opened with clearer light and more full displays of its boundless grace. *New*, as offering mercy, yea all its *blessings*, to *the nations*---to the *whole world*; which *before* were confined very much to the Jewish nation. And therefore especially *new*, as the holy Spirit should more generally and effectually set home divine truths, to the conversion of multitudes, *writing the law of God upon their hearts*, as the prophet speaks,

and

and *forgiving their ſins*. Thus God *has* done, in a meaſure for all the *faithful*, under the *old covenant*, i. e. the old *diſpenſation*, as already ſhown: but under the *new*—i. e. the new, *goſpel* diſpenſation; or *new edition* of the covenant of grace, this work of God ſhall be more abundant—the Spirit ſhall make the *law*, or *word* of God more *generally* or extenſively efficacious to ſalvation.

SECONDLY, There is therefore nothing in the conſtitution of this new covenant, that neceſſarily requires a change of the materials of the church, that is formed under it.

Mr. B. affirms p. 13, 'that there is an eſſential difference be-'tween the *materials*, as well as the *forms*, of the two chur-'ches,' Jewiſh and Chriſtian. i. e. Whereas the Jewiſh church had believing parents and their *children* in it, (which is what my book intends by *materials*) the chriſtian viſible church is made up of materials *eſſentially* different: and *theſe*, he tells us, are only thoſe that have the *law written in their hearts*, and whoſe *ſins are pardoned*——No children in *this church*, until they appear to have the *law* thus written, according to him.

Now if the *old materials* are ſhut out of the *Chriſtian church*, it muſt be, either becauſe this *new covenant*, under which the chriſtian church is gathered, cannot, in the nature and conſtitution of it, take them in; or elſe becauſe of ſome explicit *act*, or *prohibition*, that barrs their admittance. But there is nothing in the nature and conſtitution of this *new covenant*, to forbid, or exclude them. For I think I have proved, that it is the very ſame *new covenant* of grace; for ſubſtance the *ſame* that the Jewiſh church were under. And if the ſame covenant that required or promiſed *that the law ſhould be written in their hearts*, and that provided *pardon of ſin*, thro' the blood of Chriſt, DID take *parents* and their *children* into the Jewiſh church, then there can be nothing in the nature and conſtitution of this *new covenant*, to forbid the old *materials*, i. e *children's* coming, with their believing parents, into the chriſtian church. The *covenant* being the ſame, ſurely *that* may as well admit them *now* as *before*. And as for any explicit act or prohibition, forbidding children to come, neither Mr. B. nor any other, that I know of, plead ſuch a bar. Neither Jeremiah, nor Chriſt, nor his apoſtles, ſo much as intimate, that they ſhall not *take* or *keep* their former place in the church, under the new regulation. The whole weight of our opponents argument ſeems to be laid upon the tenor or frame of this new covenant; which being (as fully ſhewn) the ſame for ſubſtance as it always was, can make no alteration in the *materials* of the chriſtian church.

THIRDLY

THIRDLY, I am to shew that the christian dispensation of this new covenant, actually preserves the same materials, for kind, as the Jewish had —The text under consideration, seems evidently to favor the argument, by mentioning the old materials of the Jewish church, viz. *Israel* and *Judah*, with whom God promises to make this new covenant. Here's no intimation of any thing *new* in the *parties* of this new covenant. Nothing appears from Jeremiah's prophecy, but that parents and children, their *little ones*, should stand together, in the *new covenant*, as they did before.

I know tis here objected, that this prophecy speaks of gospel times; as appears from the apostle's application of it, Heb. 8. 8---10. and so teaches us concerning the constitution of the Christian church; therefore *Israel* and *Judah* are not here to be taken in a *literal*, but *spiritual* sense, i. e. as *gospel* subjects of the covenant.

Answer. This promise has been fulfilled, in some measure, to *Israel* and *Judah*, taken *literally*, i. e. to the Jewish church: particularly to *Judah*, upon their return from the *Babylonish captivity* as hath been observed. Which shows that there is no impropriety in supposing, that the *new covenant*, under the gospel dispensation, shall have an equal extent to *parents* and *children*, as it had under the former dispensation.

But granting that the prophet here refers to gospel times, when there shall be a more eminent accomplishment of this prophecy, upon the Christian church, gathered under this new covenant; yet that makes nothing against what I am pleading for, that the *materials* of the *Christian* church are the same as in the *Jewish*, viz. *parents* and *children*. For,

1. The first gathering of the Christian church, under this new covenant, was out of the Jewish *church* and *nation*.----Christ Jesus himself, the head of the church, was of the tribe of *Judah*, the seed of *Abraham*.——The twelve apostles were all of the *Jewish* nation, otherwise they could not have been admitted into the synagogues of the Jews. But being of their own nation, they were received as brethren, and, as such, addressed each other. Acts 13. 26. *Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham*, &c. say the apostles. *Men and brethren, what shall we do?* say the Jews to *them*. Acts 2. 37.

When Christ sent forth these twelve to preach the gospel, he forbid them to go to the *Gentiles*; *Go*, says he, *to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*, Mat. 10. 5, 6. Christ Jesus himself observed the same rule, Mat. 15. 24. *I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the hou-*

houſe of Iſrael. He came to his own, and his own received him not, John 1. 11. The generality of the Jews rejected him, but not *all*, v. 12. *As many as received him, to them gave he power*, &c. Numbers of the Jews believed in him, and became his children, John 2. 23. *At Jeruſalem, at the paſſover, many believed in his name.* John 12. 42. *Among the chief rulers many believed on him.* —— All theſe, of the Jewiſh nation, embraced chriſtianity, before Chriſt's death. Juſt after his aſcenſion, about 120 believers were together, acts 1. 15. Not many days after *that*, even at the day of pentecoſt, about 3000 were added to them: and, as we read of none but the Jews, at that time, that were pricked in the heart and enquired what they ſhould do to be ſaved, there is no reaſon to think but *theſe* were all of the Jewiſh nation, or proſelytes.

And thus the *Chriſtian* church ſprung up at firſt out of the *Jewiſh*; in which they continued their ſtanding, after that they believed in Chriſt. And, indeed, the *whole* of the antient adminiſtration of *that church*, as to the outward form of it, continued until the death of Chriſt. But he began to put an end to it the ſame night in which he was betrayed to be crucified, Luke 22. 15. 16. *With deſire have I deſired to eat this paſſover with you before I ſuffer. For I ſay unto you, I will not eat any more thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.* ——The ſufferings of Chriſt for us, were the things ſignified, by the ſacrifice of the lamb, in the paſſover, John 1. 29. 1 Cor. 5. 7. Therefore, Chriſt being on the point of ſuffering, expreſſeth his earneſt deſire 'to eat this 'paſſover with his diſciples, before he died, that he might put 'an end to this legal ſervice, which had now continued ſo many 'years, and had, all this time been but a type of him and his 'death and oblation for ſin.'* ——And when he actually ſuffered on the croſs, and *gave himſelf an offering and a ſacrifice to God for us*, he then put an end to the outward form of that antient adminiſtration; ſignified by the *rending of the vail in twain, from top to bottom*, Mat. 27. 51. All thoſe ſacrifices and branches of ſervice, that typified Chriſt to come, being fulfilled in him, ceaſed to be of any further uſe to his people; and were dropped, as faſt as the prejudices of the Jews, and the tenor of their civil conſtitution would admit of.—A new form of ſervice was then introduced by Chriſt. to be obſerved by his church, gathered under the *new covenant* diſpenſation: which new form our Lord began to ſet up, at the very hour in which he diſſolved the old; by inſtituting the goſpel ordinance of the *Lord's ſupper*, Mat. 26. 26—

28.

* Mr. Pool.

28 (having eat the passover) *Jesus took bread and blessed it and break it and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body*, &c.) And after his resurrection he instituted, or rather compleated the form of the other gospel sacrament of Baptism, Mat. 28 *Go teach all nations, baptizing of them*, &c.

Accordingly we find the Christian church religiously observing these sacred institutions of baptism and the Lord's supper, presently after Christ's ascension, even at the day of pentecost, fifty days after his passion. (Acts 2. 41. *Then they that gladly received his word were baptised.* (v. 42.) *And they continued stedfast in the apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.*—And now, we hear no more of former rites and ceremonies being *required*, or observed; only as matters of indifferency, and in condescention to the weakness and prejudices of the Jewish christians, who could not be easily and speedily brought off from them.

It being thus evident that the *first* Christian church was gathered out of the old Jewish church, i.e. made up of God's antient covenant people the Jews, under the *new* covenant dispensation of grace, with a *new* form of administration, it is easy to see what the *materials* of the *Christian* church were at first. For there was no alteration made, in any thing *essential* to the *being* of the *Jewish* church, when it became *Christian*: none but in the *outward form*. The *covenant* that made them the church of God, being the covenant of grace, which says, *I will be your God, and ye shall be my people*; and again, *I will be a God to you and to your seed*, is essentially the same, in all ages, as hath been proved: and consequently the church under that same covenant, must be *substantially* the same; for tis the *covenant* that makes it *what* it is.

'As to the Jewish church *state*,' (says Mr. Clark) 'its outward 'form of administration, by peculiar ordinances and rites of wor'ship, tis granted—was abolished, at the death of Christ. But 'the Jewish *church* with regard to its essential constitution, as a 'religious society, joined together in the bonds of the covenant, 'for the worship and service of God, to *whom pertaineth the pro*'*mises*' (*This*) 'was never abolished. But subsisted, after the 'commencement of the gospel administration, under which the 'members of *that* church, were the only church of Christ, for 'divers years after his death and resurrection, before the calling 'of the Gentiles.'*

Seeing

* Clark's Reply to Dr. Gill, p. 393-4.

Seeing then, that the members of the *Chriſtian church* were the ſame, as before were the members of the *Jewiſh*; and that they were formed into the goſpel church ſtate, under the ſame covenant of grace, *eſſentially* the ſame that they were under before, which promiſed, *that God would be a God unto them and to their ſeed*, it is abundantly evident that the Chriſtian church was made up of the ſame *materials*, i. e. believing *parents* and *their children*, as the *Jewiſh* was.

When they (the firſt believers) received Chriſt, they received him as their *promiſed Meſſiah*, the great *mercy* and bleſſing laid up in *that covenant*, which promiſed them *that God would be a God to them and to their ſeed*; therefore upon their believing in Chriſt, *they* and their *ſeed* muſt come in, or rather *continue* together in *that* covenant, which makes *Chriſt theirs*, and *God theirs*, and *them* and their *ſeed*, *his*.

Neither is there the leaſt intimation in all the goſpel, that the Jewiſh parents, who *firſt* believed and were formed into the *Chriſtian* church, came into it *without* their children, who were *with* them in the covenant and church before. But on the contrary, the *firſt* argument that the apoſtles uſed, after Chriſts aſcenſion, to perſuade the Jews to embrace *chriſtianity*, was taken from the gracious covenant of God with their fathers, Acts 2. 39. *For the promiſe is unto you and to your children.* q. d. As God promiſed your father *Abraham*, and frequently renewed the ſame with his children, ſaying, *I will be a God unto thee and to thy ſeed after thee*, even ſo it is now: the *new covenant of grace* extends to parents and children, as it always did; and not to the *Jews* only, but to the *Gentiles* alſo: for tis a *covenant of grace*, which, agreeable to its name and nature, is always opening and *enlarging*, never *contracting* its precious benefits and privileges.

Having taken a view of the Chriſtian church, in its firſt formation, out of the Jewiſh; and ſhown the evidence we have from thence, of its being made up of the ſame *materials*, I proceed to ſhew,

2. That when the *Gentiles* were added to the church, they were intitled to the ſame privileges which the Jewiſh chriſtians were poſſeſſed of, even that of *bringing their children with them.*

For Chriſt, with all his benefits, was promiſed and given to the Gentiles, in the ſame covenant, in which he was given to the Jews; and the ſame bleſſings deſcend upon *both* alike.

Speaking of the *Jews*, Acts 3. 25. ſays the apoſtle *Peter*, *Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made*

made with our fathers, ſaying unto Abraham, and in thy ſeed ſhall all the kindreds of the earth be bleſſed; alluding to Gen 22 17. where, ſpeaking to *Abraham*, God ſays, *I will bleſs thee—and thy ſeed ſhall all the nations of the earth be bleſſed.*——Now, all the bleſſings that God beſtowed upon *Abraham*, were ſummed up in thoſe words of the covenant, before mentioned, and (becauſe needful in the preſent argument) often repeated, *I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee—to be a God unto thee and to thy ſeed after thee;* which made his children the ſubjects of the covenant, and heirs of all the bleſſings contained in it; they walking *in the ſteps of the faith of their father Abraham.* And even while they are deſtitute of renewing grace, they are called and treated as *the children* of the covenant which God made with Abraham, Acts 3. 25. above.

So then, upon the Gentiles believing in Chriſt, they are *bleſſed with faithful Abraham*, Gal. 3. 9. And v. 14. *The bleſſing of Abraham comes upon the Gentiles thro' Jeſus Chriſt.* Whatever bleſſings are contained in the covenant, they belong to the believing Gentiles, as much as to the Jews, particularly *the promiſe of the Spirit thro' faith*, (v. 14) to accompany the word and means of grace, for the converſion and ſanctification of their children in God's own time. *For if ye be Chriſt's, then are ye Abraham's ſeed, and heirs according to the promiſe*, v. 29. Yea as fully as Abraham's natural ſeed were, Gal. 4. 28. *Now we brethren, as Iſaac was, are the children of promiſe.* So then, upon our believing in Chriſt, God is a God to us *Gentiles* and to *our* children, even as he was to Abraham and *his*. And therefore *we* and *our children* are ſubjects of the covenant and heirs of the promiſe, as much as Abraham and *his* children were——Thus in general.

The apoſtle to the Romans ſhows more particularly how the believing Gentiles with their children come into the church of Chriſt; under the allegory of *graffing* into an *olive tree.*

The church of old was compared to the *olive-tree*, and children to *olive plants*, *Pſal.* 128. 3. *Thy children like olive plants round thy table.* Jer. 11. 16. *The Lord call'd thy name* (i. e. Judah) *a green olive tree, fair and of goodly fruit.* And of *Iſrael* the prophet ſays, Hoſ. 14 6. *His beauty ſhall be as the olive tree.*—From hence the apoſtle fetches a ſimilitude, to illuſtrate the ſtate of the unbelieving Jews, ſhewing the loſs they ſuſtained by rejecting of Chriſt; and the advantage that the Gentiles received, upon their believing in him. Rom 11. 16, 17, and on. *If ſome of the branches were broken off, and thou being a wild olive tree* (or branch)

graft

wast grafted in amongst them (or for them) *and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree. boast not against the branches*, &c.——By the *olive tree*, we cannot with propriety understand any other than *Israel*, the Jewish church, called, as above, by the *name of a green olive tree*.—By the *root*, we must understand the *covenant made* with *Abraham* and his seed; which was the root from whence the Jewish church sprung up, and on which it stood.—The *fatness* of the *olive tree* intends all the visible privileges, promises, graces, ordinances, spiritual blessings and benefits which the Jewish church, by virtue of that covenant, was endowed with; among which the covenant interest of their children, and right to the seal, whereby they became the visible members of that church, was a principal one.—The natural branches of this *olive tree*, or *church*, were the Jews, the seed of Abraham.—For *rejecting* Christ, the sum of all the blessings in the covenant, they were cast out of the church; which was their breaking off---they *were broken off because of unbelief*, ver. 20.—The *Gentiles* are wild branches, i. e. cut *out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature*, v. 24. 'Taken from the heathenish unbelieving 'world, *strangers from the covenants of promise*.—When the branches were broken off, that is, the unbelieving Jews, cast out of the church, and cut off from all the privileges of it, their brethren, the Jews who *believed* in Christ, were 'left standing in 'the *olive tree*,' in the church, (which, as to the substance of it, remained as it was) under the *new* covenant, in full possession of all the essential privileges and benefits of the church and covenant of grace, as the spiritual 'seed of Abraham, under a far better 'dispensation.—And 'among these, the converted Gentiles were 'the branches grafted in:' that is, the Gentiles, by faith in Christ, were joined to that *olive tree*, to that *church* from which the branches, the unbelieving Jews were broken off—*grafted in amongst them*, i. e. joined to the church, amongst *them* that continued in it, by faith in Jesus Christ. And so became '*fellow-heirs* (with the' believing 'Jews') *and of the same body*, 'and 'partakers of his promise, *in Christ, by the gospel*, Eph. 3. 6.'

Now, since it is certain that the unbelieving Jews, both parents and children, were cut off from the root, the covenant with Abraham, and cast out of the Jewish church, (for they were not *in* any other) and when they are converted, shall be grafted into the *same church* again: for v. 24. They shall *be grafted into their* OWN *olive tree*; and none but the *Jewish* church can be called *their own*: and since the believing Gentiles took the place of the branches,

branches, or Jews that were broken off, and were joined to the same church, from which the Jews were cast out; (for *they were broken off that I might be graffed in*, says the Gentile, v. 19, which St. Paul conceded to v. 20) and so were graffed in *for* them (as margin) i. e. in *their* room; or *among st* them (as the text has it) that is, amongst them that believed, and so kept their standing in the church;—From these things, I say, (which I think are quite clear) it undeniably follows,

1. That the *Jewish* and *Christian* churches are *for substance* the same, containing the same essential privileges and blessings, secured to them and bestowed upon them, by virtue of that gracious covenant, *I will be your God, and you shall be my people*: and those churches differ in nothing but in the outward form of administration, as hath been observed. And,

2. That the believing Gentiles, upon their being *graffed in*, or *joined* to the church, in the place of those that were cast out, and *among* the believing Jews that kept their standing, must therefore partake of the *same privileges* and *benefits* which the ejected Jews were cut off from, for their unbelief; and which the believing Jews continued in the possession of: and the apostle tells us what those privileges and blessings are, v. 17. *And thou*—(the Gentile)—*with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree*, i. e. (as our opponents grant) the fatness and goodness of the house of God, the ordinances, blessings and privileges of the church, even all that the promise or covenant contains: one of which precious privileges, is that of *parents* and *children* together in covenant, making up the visible church of God; which as I acknowlege was the constitution of the antient Jewish church, in which, *essentially* considered, the believing Gentiles are *graffed* or taken, under the *gospel dispensation*; which alters nothing but the *outward* form, and no ways affects the essential privileges or subjects of the covenant, as hath been fully shown: and therefore *believing parents* and *their children*, are the materials of *the church* under the *Christian* or *gospel* dispensation, as they were under the *Jewish*.

Doctor Gill* has a very singular thought upon these words of the apostle, which he improves to evade the force of the argument above. He says, 'by the *olive tree* is not meant the *Jewish* 'church, but the *gospel church state*, in its first foundation; *out of* 'which were left the *Jews that believed* not, meant by the branches broken off.'

Rep.

* Strictures upon Mr. Bostwick, p. 97.

Reply, So then they were never *in* this *olive tree*—never *in* this new founded church ſtate; they were *left out of it*, ſays he. How then could they be ſaid to be *broken off from it? Broken off* neceſſarily implies that they who *are* broken off, were once *in*, or united *to*, *that* which they are broken off from. And thus the original word ſignifies, being quite different from that of *leaving out*. So that if the *olive tree* means the *goſpel church ſtate*, and the unbelieving Jews were left out of *that*, never *in* it, it is certain they could not be broken *off from it*.

But the apoſtle ſhews plainly, that the Jews who were broken off, *were* actually *in* this *olive tree*, which he is ſpeaking of: v. 23. *If they abide not ſtill in unbelief*, they *ſhall be graffed in*—(v. 24. *Graffed into their own olive tree*) For (ſays he, v. 23.) *God is able to graff them in again*. How can they be ſaid to be graffed in *again*, if they were not *once in*, or in *before?*—Surely this cannot conſiſt with grammar nor good ſenſe.

Therefore the *olive tree* cannot be the *goſpel church ſtate*; but muſt intend the *Jewiſh church*, in its antient conſtitution; *in which* Chriſt found theſe branches the Jews, and *from* which they were broken off, or caſt out, for refuſing their promiſed Meſſiah. This, even the *Jewiſh church*, was their *own olive tree*—their own church, to which they once belonged, and to which they ſhall be joined again, when their heart of unbelief ſhall be taken away.

Touching Mr. B's third ſentiment, as I have laid it down, if I have not miſtaken him, in his 13th page, viz. 'That the materials 'of the viſible church, under this new covenant, are all truly gracious perſons,' I need ſay but a few words.

That this is his meaning, I collect from his ſaying, in oppoſition to me, 'that there is an *eſſential* difference between the *ma*'*terials* of the two churches,' i. e. the *Jewiſh* and the *Chriſtian*, of which I was ſpeaking: and then going on to deſcribe the *Chriſtian* church, ſaying, 'all Abraham's ſeed in a *goſpel* ſenſe, have 'the law written in their *hearts*, and their *ſins ſhall be remembered* '*no more*,' Heb. 10. 16. 17. Accordingly it was ſuch as *gladly* '*received the word*, and ſuch as *ſhould be ſaved*, that *were added to* '*the church*, in the apoſtles times, Acts 2.'——Theſe things, I ſay (to make him conſiſtent, that is, to ſpeak to the point in hand which was Chriſt's *viſible church*) muſt ſuppoſe him to hold, that Chriſt's church conſiſts of none but gracious perſons; or that none but *ſuch* are *in* his viſible church, under this new covenant—This is plainly to ſay, that the *viſible church* of Chriſt on earth, conſiſts of none but ſuch as belong to the *inviſible*: if

it

it does not take them *all*, yet *all* that it does take in, according to the tenor of the new covenant, in its visible administration, are such sanctified persons: which is not only contrary to all sound divines, and contrary to fact, but also contrary to what he himself lays down, in the next sentence. For as soon as he had described a church of *converted* persons, such as were added in the apostles times, he observes, that even then, 'some of a contrary character got in, which are said to *creep in unawares*.' Gal. 2. 4. Jude 4. That is, into the church of Abraham's *gospel seed*, who have the *law written in their hearts*. Whether they got in by *creeping*—slily or boldly—thro' the carelesness of the church, or with their consent, and according to their judgment, it matters not in the present case—they are *in the church*: and so tis, after all, but a visible church, of the common stamp; a church of *professing believers*, or *visible* saints, of which there may be some unsound at heart.

But if I mistake Mr. B.—if he is there speaking only of the *invisible church*, (and to be sure his characters belong only to *that*) saying, they are such as have the *law written in their hearts*—are *pardoned* and *shall be saved*, I know not *whom* he opposes, nor who contradicts *him*—to be sure he has no controversy with *me* upon that head.—— So that, upon the whole, I hope I may safely conclude, In the last place,

That in my saying, 'Is it not reasonable to suppose that the 'Christian church is made up of the same materials that the 'Jewish church was,' I have not erred from the scripture, and that 'God has' *not* 'said the contrary,' as Mr. B. confidently affirms.

Chapter VI.

Wherein the arguments that he brings, to show that there is an essential difference between the present standing churches, and those first settled in the country, are considered and answered; more especially what he says about ordination, matter of a gospel church, and connection of churches with civil authority.

IN my book, p. 78, 79, I say that 'the churches of this land, 'are, in general, of the congregational way.' That altho'

in some parts 'they are *consociated*, or united together, for mutu-
'al benefit, yet they are properly *congregational*.' Which constitution, tho' in general good, and, rightly understood and improved, has many blessings in it, yet I say, p. 80. 'after all, our 'churches come short of perfection.

And as an instance of their imperfection, I mention the indulgence of Cambridge Platform, in disposing to the *brethren* the power of *ordaining* elders, and other church officers, by the appointment of the church.——This service, 'I apprehend, the 'gospel has committed wholly to the care of the presbytery, or 'ministers of the churches'

Mr B. p. 15 bottom, and 16 top, observes, that 'Cambridge 'Platform says, the church, since the coming of Christ, is only 'congregational—has the whole power of church government, 'in each particular church—power to open and shut, to choose 'and refuse, to constitute in office, and to remove from office.' Platf. p. 16.—And so he concludes there is an *essential* difference.

Here I confess there is some *material* difference, in the *principles* laid down, though the *practice* of the churches is *generally* if not *universally* as I have said it ought to be.—Even our fathers, who compiled the platform, prefer and recommend *ministerial* ordination. 'Where there are elders (say they) imposition of hands in ordi-'nation is to be performed by those elders. And the same may 'be performed by the *elders* of *other* churches, where a church 'has none,' platf. p. 22.——And this I take to have been the steady practice of the churches, from the date of the platform; at least in general—Therefore I waved the dispute in my sermons.

But since the *power* of the *church*, i. e. the *brotherhood* to ordain, is so much pleaded for at this day by our brethren of the separate interest, I will a little enquire what warrant there is for it in scripture.

Mr. B. p. 16 says of me, 'While he usurps the name' (congregational) 'he denies a principal point in its meaning, and sets 'up a power above the churches—But our fathers had seen too 'much of this spiritual tyranny to be willing to come under it 'again.'

Reply. Our excellent fathers, of precious memory, for piety, learning and great abilities, had indeed felt the severities of a usurped power at home—the power of the clergy. Their fresh remembrance, and great abhorrence of which, indangered them of the other extreme, in building the house of God in this wilderness. *Here* they abate to themselves of the *power* which

Christ

Christ their Lord had given *them*, in the point of ordination; and put over into the hands of the *brotherhood* such authority as *He* has not, in the gospel, vested them with.

This (and not the 'joining of these two powers,' church and state, 'together,' in such a manner, and for such ends, as the scriptures have evidently joined them) 'was,' I am persuaded, one of 'the worst mistakes that our fathers brought with them 'to this land,' p 28. The 'tyranny' of the *clergy* is truly to be dreaded; and no less so is that of the *brotherhood*. May we all be saved from both ——— To return, ———

Our worthy fathers tell us, platf. p 16. that tis 'the *ruling* 'elders work, to join with the *pastor* and *teacher*—to open and 'shut the doors of God's house—by *ordination* of officers chosen, 'by the church,' &c. Which shows that they looked upon it to be the *proper business* of *ministers* to *ordain*, as most naturally resulting from their office. But in a church where there is *no elder*, there they allowed that *chosen* brethren *may* lay on hands, as hath been said.

This is an affair that belongs to God's house, of which Jesus Christ is head and king; and none may rightfully dare to set up any practice, or establish any order in his house, but what he has directed to: to be sure none contrary to his direction. The holy *scriptures* therefore, not the *platform*, (tho' honored for its authors sake, as well as for its real worth) are to guide us in this important question.

The subject has been so often discussed, by hands so much superior to the present *disputants*, that the *public* will be much better edified by *their* sentiments than *mine*.

The author before quoted,* handles the dispute, with a special reference to *Cambridge* platform, (the *compilers* of which are highly honored and esteemed by the assembly that wrote) in the following manner.

They argue,

'*First*, From the constant practice of the church of Christ, as 'it is set down in the apostolical writings. We challenge any 'man to shew any one text in all the new testament, for the 'justification of *popular* ordination. We read of ordination by 'apostles, Acts 6. Acts 14. 23. and by prophets and teachers, 'Acts 13. 1—3. and by evangelists, Tit. 1. 1 Tim. 5. 22. and 'by a presbytery, 1 Tim. 4. 14. but for ordination by the *peo*-'*ple* we meet not at all with it. And without all peradventure, 'if

* Jus Divinum, chap. 13. p. 185. and on.

'if ordination be an ordinance of Christ, it is to be managed according to the will of Christ, and that is by *ministers*, and not 'by the community of believers. May we not say to such 'churches, that usurp upon this work, as it is said Matth. 21 23. '*By what authority do you these things? and who gave you this* 'authority? Shew us your warrant out of the word. We read 'of ordination *in churches*, Acts 14. 23. and *in cities*, Tit. 1. 5. 'but no where of ordination *by churches*, or *by cities*, taking 'them for *believers*, without officers.'

'*Secondly*, Ordination by the people is not only *not written in* 'scripture, but is *against* the scripture. For to what end and 'purpose should Jesus Christ appoint officers, extraordinary and 'ordinary, for the doing of that work which the people themselves '*may* do? To what purpose did *Paul* and *Barnabas* go from place 'to place, to ordain elders? Why was *Titus* left in *Crete* to appoint elders in every city? Might not the people say, what 'need Paul leave *Titus* to do *that* which we can do ourselves?— 'Certainly ordination is not the *people's*, but the *ministers* office.'

'*Thirdly*, All that is written in the epistles, concerning the '*ordainers*, and the qualification of the *ordained*, &c. is all written 'in the epistles unto *Timothy* and *Titus* who were *church officers*. 'In other epistles, which were written unto the *churches*, there 'is no mention made of these things: which doth abundantly 'prove unto us, that the work of ordination is a work belonging 'to *ministers* and not to the *people*.'

Omitting other arguments, I shall add what they say in direct answer to that rule, laid down in the platform of church discipline, chap. 9. 'In such churches where there are no elders, 'imposition of hands may be performed by some of the brethren, 'chosen by the church thereunto, For the proof of this they '(the elders of New-England) being a *reason* and a *scripture*.'

'*The reason is*, If the people may elect officers, which is *the* 'greater, and wherein the substance of the office consists; they 'may, much more, (occasion and need so requiring) impose hands 'in ordination, which *is* the *less*, and but the accomplishment of 'the other.'

'Answer 1. If this argument were valid, it would follow, 'that people might ordain their own ministers, not only when 'they *want* elders, but when they *have* elders.'

'2. We say, that scripture light being judge, election is not 'the *greater*, and ordination the *less*.---*Election* is only the *designation* of the person that is to be *made* a *minister*, not the *making*

of

'of him a *minister*. Ordination—is held forth in the ſcripture, 'as the *greater*; and therefore not given to one and the ſame 'perſons but referred to the more honorable perſons; as appears 'from Acts 6 3 5—6. *Brethren, look ye out ſeven men of honeſt 'report full of the Holy Ghoſt whom* WE *may appoint* over this buſineſs. Tit 1. 5. For this cauſe left I thee in Crete, that *thou 'ſhouldeſt ordain* elders, in every city, as I had *appointed thee*. '1 Tim. 4 14 Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was 'given thee by prophecy, *with the laying on of the hands of the 'preſbytery*. ——— Theſe are the very paſſages of ſcripture, which the worthy compilers of the platform bring to ſhew that *election* is the *greater* work, and *ordination* the *leſs*: But I cannot ſee how it appears, from theſe paſſages, unleſs that, becauſe the *apoſtles* were *greater* than the *brethren*, therefore the work which *they* did, and which they were appointed to do, was *leſs* than what the *brethren* did: which I believe is not good logic. Acts 6. 3, 5, 6. above.

But the aſſembly goes on ——

'The *text* they' (i. e. the platform) 'quote in the margin, for 'the proof of this is not out of the *new teſtament*, but the *old*; 'out of Numb 8. 10, 11. *And thou* (Moſes) *ſhall bring the Levites 'before the Lord, and the children of Iſrael ſhall put their hands upon 'the Levites: and Aaron ſhall offer the Levites before the Lord, for 'an offering of the children of Iſrael that they may execute the ſervice of 'the Lord* —This is the only text of ſcripture brought to prove *popular* ordination.

'Anſ. 1. This text doth not prove *that* for which it is bro't, 'but makes rather againſt our brethren. For they ſay that 'where there are elders, impoſition of hands, is to be by the el-'ders, and not by the people, but in caſe of want of elders. But '*here*, *Aaron* and his ſons were preſent. And if it proves any 'thing, it proves that the people may ordain, where there are 'elders; which our brethren will not conſent unto.

'2. That the children of *Iſrael* were *commanded* by God im-'mediately, to lay on hands upon the Levites. But in the new 'teſtament we meet with no ſuch command, laid upon the peo-'ple. We read that *Timothy* and *Titus* and the *preſbytery* are 'to lay on hands; but not a word of *command* for the *people*, but 'rather againſt it, as we have ſhewed.

'3. When it was ſaid, that the children of *Iſrael* laid on hands, 'it is not imaginable that *all* the Iſraelites did put on hands; 'but it was done by ſome chief of them in the name of the reſt.

'And as *Ainsworth* observes, it was done by the FIRST-BORN *for* 'the first-born was sanctified and consecrated unto the Lord, Exod. '13. 12. And now the Levites were taken, by God, instead of 'the first-born; as appears Numbers 8. 16——19. And hence 'it was that the children of Israel, that is, the first-born of Israel, 'were to lay on hands upon them; for the Levites gave an 'atonement for them, and were offered up unto the Lord, in 'their stead; and, as the Rabbins say, every first born laid on 'hands on the Levite that was for him; which if it be so, will 'afford us two other answers to this text.

'4. That the children of *Israel* had not only a special *command*, 'but a special *reason* also, for what they did. And therefore 'this example cannot be made a pattern for new-testament prac-'tice.

'5. That this laying on of hands upon the Levites, was not 'for them, to set *them* apart for the *service* of the Lord, but ra-'ther a setting them apart for a *sacrifice* unto the Lord. It was 'the command of God, that the children of *Israel* must put their 'hands upon the sacrifices they did offer unto the Lord. The 'Levites were now to be *waved* (v. 11) or offered before the 'Lord, for an offering of the children of *Israel*, and to be offered 'instead of the *first-born*, (v. 18.) And therefore the *first-born* 'did put their hands upon them as their propitiation and atone-'ment.

'It is very observable, that notwithstanding this imposition 'of hands, the Levites were not, thereupon, invested into their 'office, and made able *immediately* to execute it. But *Aaron the* 'priest was to *wave* them, before the Lord, for a *wave offering*, 'that they might execute the service of the Lord, (as v. 11.) It 'was *Aaron's waving* of the Levites, and separating of them from 'among the children of *Israel*, that did constitute and make them 'church officers.'

Thus that venerable assembly of divines, at *London*, differed in sentiment from our worthy fathers, in this point, of *popular ordination*, for the weighty reasons above: but at the same time, there was no want of esteem and friendship for each other.

They add, 'We can truly say (as our brethren do in their 'preface to the platform) 'that it is far from us so to *attest* the 'discipline of Christ, as to *detest* the *disciples* of Christ; so to con-'tend for the seamless coat of Christ, as to crucify the living 'members of Christ; so to divide ourselves about church com-'munion, as, thro' breaches, to open a wide gap for a deluge of

anti-

'antichriſtian and profane maligaity to ſwallow up both church 'and civil ſtate.'

So that according to thoſe judicious and catholic divines, altho' there is a *material* difference in ſentiment, about the power of ordination, yet there is not an *eſſential difference* between the churches; at leaſt not ſuch as to interrupt their fellowſhip.

In pages 17 and 18, Mr. B touches upon the power of congregational churches, with reſpect to admitting and caſting out communicants: and tells us, that Dr. Increaſe Mather ſays, 'that the *church* (and not the officers *only*) have power given 'them by Chriſt to judge,' concerning the meetneſs of thoſe that are to be taken into their communion and who are to be caſt out. And upon it, aſks p. 18, top, 'And is this the way now of the 'church Mr. F. pleads for? No; I never knew an inſtance in 'my day, of any who were admitted into any of thoſe churches, 'by declaring *perſonally* the faith wro't in their ſouls.'

Reply. I have really nothing to do with Mr. B. upon this head—tis out of the queſtion; as a particular church is not *the church*, which my ſermons treat about.

However, I will juſt obſerve, that as to *perſonal* relations, before the aſſembly, whether *written* or *oral*, Cambridge platform don't make it a *term*. Plat. p. 32. ſect. 4. In caſe of "exceſſive fear, '&c.—tis ſufficient that the *elders*, having received private ſatisfaction, make relation thereof in public before the church, &c.

But he proceeds further on the ſubject, p. 18, middle, 'This 'leads us down to a *third* article of difference which is the root 'of all, namely, the *matter* of a goſpel church.'

Note I thought we had juſt been ſpeaking about the *matter* of a goſpel church, when we laſt ſpoke of its members.——But he has yet to ſay,

'We have already ſeen that Mr. F. ſuppoſes that the Chriſtian 'church is made up of the ſame *materials* that the Jewiſh church 'was.'

True, I have ſuppoſed ſo—and ſee no reaſon to alter my ſentiments, from what Mr. B. has ſaid againſt it.

'But' (ſays he) 'Cambridge platform expreſly ſays, the matter 'of a viſible church are ſaints by calling.' And then immediately ſtarts from the *matter* to the *form* of a viſible church, ſaying, tis 'not provincial nor claſſical.' But let us ſettle the *matter* firſt, —this is *our* point.

The platform (p. 5. ch. 3. ſect. 2.) explains what it ſays above, 'that the *matter* of a viſible church, are ſaints by calling

'By

'By saints we understand (1) Such as have not only attained the 'knowlege of the principles of religion, and are free from gross 'and open scandals, but also do together with the profession of their 'faith & repentance, walk in blameless obedience to the word, so as 'that, in *charitable discretion*, they may be *accounted* saints by calling; '(tho' perhaps some or more of them be unsound and hypocrites 'inwardly) &c. And (2) The *children* of such, who are also 'holy'——Here are the very *materials* of Christ's visible church, that I described in my book, viz. professing believers or such as may be *accounted* saints by calling, and *their children*. And Mr. B. to shew the world my error, and to prove that there is an essential difference between the standing churches, and those that were first settled in the country, brings the platform of those very churches, to speak the *same thing* that I do. Surely here is *distinction* without difference, and *contention* without contradiction.

But altho' this is what Mr. B. really does say by his reference to the platform, yet I conclude tis not what he *intended* to say; for he presently resumes the *matter* of a gospel church, and tells what he means by it, (viz.) a church of *communicants*, p. 18. bottom, 'A learned and renowned author (i. e. Dr. Owen) has 'evidenced that the letting go this principle, that particular 'churches ought to consist of *regenerate persons*, brought in the 'great *apostate of the Christian church*. The way to prevent the 'like apostacy (says Dr *Mather*) in these churches, is to require 'an account of those that offer themselves to *communion* therein, 'concerning the *work of God in their souls*, as well as concerning 'their knowlege and belief' p. 19. top.——But here he has entirely left the subject, that he himself proposed a little back, viz. the *materials* of the church, in *my sense*. For he says, 'We 'have already seen that Mr. F supposes, that the Christian 'church is made up of the same *materials* that the Jewish church 'was;' that is, of believing parents and their children, viz. Christ's visible church in the large sense, as the platform describes it. To what purpose then does he tell of a church, consisting *only* of *brethren*, *in full communion*? Neither I, nor our fathers, whom he quotes, i. e. the *platform*, meant a church of Christ, in *that* sense; for neither of us can be supposed to speak of *infants* belonging to such a visible church, i. e. of their being *in full* communion. And yet he is shewing an *essential* difference between the *standing churches*, and the *first* in the land.——All the difference is, they *exactly agree*.

But

But 'The church under the law was *national*, which since the 'coming of Christ is only *congregational*; therefore neither nati-'onal, provincial nor classical,' says Mr. B.—And yet says he, p. 18. middle, 'Mr. F has the *face* to tell the world that their 'churches are, in general, properly congregational.'

Reply This quotation is a scrap of what I had more largely spoken, p. 78, 79. of my sermons; where I say, 'that, altho in 'many parts, particularly in this colony (Connecticut) they are, 'for mutual benefit, *consociated*, yet they are—properly congre-'gational.' So that, I suppose, my error lies in calling them *congregational*, when I had said they were *consociated*.

Mr. *Hobart*, in his vindication of the piece, intitled 'The 'Principles of Congregational Churches,' &c. p. 4, says, 'Our 'constitution (by which this controversy must be issued) is that 'of *congregational churches united in consociation*.'

Doctor *Coleman* observes, p. 9. with that great judgment and accuracy which he was remarkable for, 'that the *consociation* of 'churches is the very SOUL and LIFE of the *congregational* 'scheme—without which we must be *independent*, and with 'which all the good of *presbyterianism* is attainable.'———Thus our churches that are *consociated* view themselves. And as the very sensible and judicious writers above, '*had the face*' to call them *congregational*, I hope that I might venture to call them so.

Here Mr. B. leaves his proper business, to go and visit the college; and represents me as *partial*, with respect to a quotation out of Doctor *Increase Mather*, in *favor* of the college, p. 18, bottom. 'Yet' (says he) 'he stopt a little too short at last; for that 'venerable author's next words are these, viz. 'Nor are the 'churches like to continue *pure golden candlesticks*, if the *college* '(which *should supply* them) prove *apostate*.'—He then directly traverses back to the *matter* of a church of *communicants*.

With respect to the Doctor's serious observation above, I heartily concur with it; and by no means *stopped short of it*, through fear of its weakning my argument, which was, the importance, yea, necessity of a college, to supply the churches with ministers of a suitable furniture. Which the Doctor abundantly confirms, by the *weighty expression* before us. For here he evidently shows, that the *purity* of the churches would soon cease, upon the *apostacy* of the college, that *should* supply them with *ministers*. By which it appears to be his settled opinion and judgment, that the churches would have no reason to expect a supply of *able* and *faithful ministers*, if the *college* failed of producing them. For it

seems

seems, that venerable father did not think of looking to the *fields*, *shops*, or *fishing boats*, for men of accomplishments to feed the flock of Christ with *knowlege* and *understanding*. No, that pious, learned, and judicious instructor, who had just before said, 'that 'the churches cannot subsist without a *college*,' did evidently suppose, that the churches would not only be *corrupted*, but soon demolished, if they had none to feed and guide them, but ignorant and unlearned men. Nay he evidently shows his thought to be (taking *both* the expressions above together) that a *corrupt college*, and *none* at all, would either of them prove the *ruin of the churches*.

And now, as the Doctor's expression of his pious fear, lest the *college* should apostatize to the ruin of the churches, (considered in the obvious light above) is full of instruction, and affords plentiful matter of *conviction* and *humiliation* to the separate *teachers*, I heartily wish and pray, that Mr. *Backus* and his *brethren* might think seriously upon it, and be really profited by it —— And I leave it with him to examine, whether he did not intend to insinuate, by this quotation, that the *colleges* are now *so* corrupt, that 'tis unsafe for the churches to take their supply of *ministers* from thence?

To shew the great apostacy of the churches in the land, about the time of the separations from them, Mr. B p 19 2c quotes a passage out of the *Windham* association's letter; which I think he very much mistakes and makes an ill use of. Speaking of the parable of the *wheat* and the *tares*, they say p. 21. That by *the kingdom of heaven*, in most places, we are to understand the evangelists to intend 'The *visible church* here on earth, consisting of good and 'bad men, of *real* and *nominal* christians —— In this sense is the 'kingdom of heaven here to be understood;' (Mat. 13. 24, &c.) 'Our Saviour explains it so to his disciples, as you see from v. 37. 'where he says, *the field is the world*; in which therefore, is this 'kingdom of heaven. *The good seed, are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one.* Both the 'one and the other' (i. e. the good seed and the tares) 'are in 'that kingdom of heaven, which is in the world, i. e. the visible 'church.' ——Upon which Mr. B p. 20. says, 'They have contradicted our Saviour in explaining the parable of the *tares*, and 'the *field*, which he says is the *world*, they say is the *church*.'

Reply, This is evidently a doing violence to the expressions of that excellent letter. The gentlemen's meaning, I think, is very obvious, to one that is disposed to take them right. For

they

they had just referred their people to the explanation, which our Saviour gave his disciples of the parable, v. 37. where he says, *The field is the world*.—Thus they would have people understand it; and thus they understood it themselves. And can they be supposed to contradict it, in express terms, while their eye was upon the explanation, which they had given and approved of? 'Tis impossible. Modesty must needs constrain us to think otherwise. They don't mean nor say, as Mr. B. charges them, that the *field*, is the *church*. Their words are, 'Both the one and the other are in *that kingdom of heaven, which* is in *the world*: the relative, *which*, agrees with the *kingdom of heaven*, that went before; said to be *in the world*; now, the sentence is out, with respect to the *world*—they have done with *that*: and then revive the explanation which they gave at first, *of the kingdom of heaven*, saying, *that is, the visible church*. So the sentence is plainly *this*, 'Both the 'one and the other are in that *kingdom of heaven*, which is in the 'world, that is, (not the *world*, but) the *kingdom of heaven* is, 'the *visible church*.'

But to go on—The book before me is truly miscellaneous—From about the 19th p. to the 32d, Mr. B. has such an exuberance of matters and things—so mixed, inconnected and without order, (which indeed is common to other parts of the performance) that I cannot easily see, where to find him, nor in what argument to engage: so must pass over many things.

The grand point we set out upon, was the *essential difference* between the *standing* churches and the *first* in the country.—The *third* and *last* mentioned article of difference was, the *matter* of a gospel church.—He has given no notice of a *fourth*: but many things follow after this, viz. the *matter*, which seem not to be any ways related to it. However we must suppose them all designed to prove the great point in view, viz. the essential difference between the present churches, and those first settled in the country, p. 15, and on.

One thing that he speaks of in these pages, as amiss in the standing churches, which he calls, p. 28, 'the core of our diffi-'culties,' is, *the union of the two powers, church and state*. 'The 'confounding of civil and ecclesiastical affairs together (says he) 'has done amazing mischief in the world.' This was the worst 'mistake (he adds) that our fathers bro't with them into this 'land.' p. idem.

This is not only beside his professed design, which is that of shewing the *essential difference*, &c. but, I think, a very groundless exception

exception against the churches; in that he faults them for a connection which is evidently warranted by the holy scriptures.

I would by no means undertake to justify *all* the steps that are or may be taken, by these united powers. In this imperfect state, they may, doubtless, depart from the rule—go out of their respective provinces, in exerting their supposed authority, towards one another, either in defending what they think is right, or in censuring and punishing what is looked upon as wrong. And so, from hence mischief may arise.

Neither do I mean to run the line, or fix bounds for the civil power in union, and say, hitherto shalt thou come and no further. This is too delicate an affair for me to attempt, even if my subject led me to it.

I shall therefore only observe, that we must keep up a distinction between the *acts* or *administrations* of the two powers in union. That which *one* does, is its *own* act, and not the act of the *other*. What the *state* does, is not to be charged to the *church*: and *vice versa*.——This I suppose to be self-evident.

And therefore it is wholly out of rule and quite injurious, for Mr. B. to charge the *churches* or their *ministers* with sending men to jail for *rates*, and other like *prosecutions* (as he rudely talks and unreasonably complains, thro' out his book) for *these* proceedings are evidently *the acts* of the civil state—done for its own utility, and what properly belong to it, as they refer to civil contracts or laws, the violations of which neither are nor can be corrected by any power but the *magistrate*, whose office and duty it is to redress the wrongs of the *subjects*, not as *members* of the *church*, but of *civil community*.

Now, that the church and state may, and ought to unite, keeping, at the same time, within their respective provinces, is evident from the scriptures. Thus were the Jewish church and state united, strengthening one another in the affairs of the kingdom and the house of God; still keeping their places and acts distinct. Tho' the church was national, and so the whole nation was the church, yet the affairs of the kingdom, as a civil polity, such as the executing of justice and judgment, were things distinct from the service of the sanctuary, such as burning incense, offering sacrifices, and other branches of worship. And accordingly their civil and religious officers, were different setts of men, performing different services, and maintaining as distinct an authority in their respective provinces, as now takes place, or should do, in congregational churches and civil communities. Neither might

one intermeddle with the office and buſineſs of the *other*, *then*, any more than *now*, or now than then. *Go out of the ſanctuary, for it appertaineth not unto thee to burn incenſe*, &c. ſaid the valiant prieſts to king Uzziah, when he invaded their office, 2 Chron. 26. 18.—And yet the *church ſtate*, and *civil*, were cloſely and ſtrongly united together, for mutual benefit; nor did the union fail of its end. *Moſes*, who was *king* in Jeſuran, and *Aaron* the *prieſt* of the Lord, went *hand* in *hand*, encouraging and ſtrengthening each other, in the buſineſs of their reſpective houſes, the *kingdom* and the *tabernacle*; and this *union* was the ſtrength and the glory of Iſrael.—On this account the pſalmiſt gives Jeruſalem that beautiful character, Pſal. 122. 3 *Jeruſalem is built as a city that is compact together.* 'Their civil and religious intereſts 'ſtrongly united for the benefit of the whole community,' as appears from the following verſes 4 5. *Whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord, unto the teſtimony of Iſrael, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord*, i. e to worſhip God, *as his church*; in which they had the countenance and protection of the civil magiſtrate, as the next verſe plainly teaches; *For there* (in Jeruſalem, where the people of God come to worſhip, *there*) *are ſet thrones of judgment, the thrones of the houſe of David.* 'A goodly ſight, '(ſays *Henry*) that the teſtimony of Iſrael and the ſet thrones of 'judgment were ſuch near and good neighbours, i. e. mutually 'ſerving one another. The teſtimony of Iſrael directing the 'thrones of judgment, and *theſe* protecting the teſtimony of Iſ-'rael.'* Thus evidently were the *religious* and *civil intereſts* of the Jews united.

If any ſay, *that* was a *national* church, and ſo no pattern for goſpel churches,—I anſwer, I can't ſee the leaſt force or weight in the objection; for tho' it was a *national* church, yet it was *God's* church, of his own building, upon the ſame foundation, and under the ſame covenant of grace for ſubſtance, as the chriſtian church is; and as well guarded by heaven, yea, by dint of a powerful providence: and yet the civil authority is ſet to guard it. It contained the ſame ſpiritual treaſures and heavenly bleſſings, as the Chriſtian church does; and *this* the ſame, for ſubſtance, with *that*. And therefore the *Chriſtian church* not only ſtands in the ſame need of civil protection and aſſiſtance as the *Jewiſh* did, but may as lawfully unite.

Accordingly, to comfort Zion, under the loſs of her natural children, when the body of the Jews ſhould be cut off from the

* Mr. Lord's Election Sermon, p. 7.

church, for their unbelief, God ſends her a precious promiſe, that he would lift up his hand to the Gentiles and bring them into the *church* in multitudes, and protect it by thoſe powers of the earth, that ſhould at firſt oppoſe her intereſt. Iſa. 49. 23. *And kings ſhall be thy nurſing fathers, and queens thy nurſing mothers.* As nurſes or parents take care of their helpleſs children, carrying of them in their arms, treating of them with all tenderneſs and affection, and ſtretching out their hands for their protection and defence, ſo ſhall kings and queens treat the church of Chriſt. Which has been fulfilled in goſpel times; as Mr. *Pool* obſerves, in that 'many kings and emperors of the Gentile world—after 'Chriſt's time, did both themſelves embrace the true religion, 'and *ſet it up* in their ſeveral dominions.'

And *this* prophecy, connected with the apoſtle's exhortation, to pray for *civil rulers*, makes it abundantly evident, that God intended *them* for the benefit of his *church*, as well as the protection of the ſtate. 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. I exhort *that—prayers*, interceſſions and giving of *thanks*, be made for all men; *for kings and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godlineſs and honeſty.*—Pray, doubtleſs, for their *converſion*, (as the kings of the earth were then heathen) that they might embrace the Chriſtian religion—join the *church* of Chriſt, and ſo become hearty friends to *that* ſociety, which now needs their ſuccour and protection. For the *church* or *chriſtians*, are here directed to pray for the civil magiſtrate; not only that we may live a quiet and peaceable life, in all *honeſty*—that our *civil privileges* and *temporal* intereſts may be defended and ſecured to us; but alſo, nay, firſt of all, that we may live a quiet and peaceable life in *all godlineſs*—that our *worſhip*, and *religious rights* may be guarded ſafely againſt all moleſtations. And this neceſſarily implies, not only that the magiſtrate ſhould not *himſelf* lay hands on us, nor ſend his officers and ſervants to ſpoil us *of*, or interrupt us *in*, the enjoyment of our religious rights; but alſo, that, as he has it in his power, he would reſtrain and puniſh thoſe that ſhould moleſt or trouble us, in matters of *godlineſs* or *religion*, as well as in matters of *honeſty*, which we have right to, in common with other men.

Accordingly our pious fathers, when they ſettled the church in this country, were ſo ſenſible of the duty and importance of the magiſtrates interpoſing in matters of religion, that they ſpend a whole and a long chapter in treating about it, Platform p. 51, and on, intitled, '*The Civil Magiſtrate's Power in Matters Eccleſiaſtical*,'

ſiaſtical,' which is done with ſo much *caution judgment* and *excellency of ſpirit*, that tis pity Mr. B. had not contented himſelf with the rules *there* laid down, or taken his maxims from thence, inſtead of thoſe which he has framad for public uſe, and given us from p 23 to 28.

But Mr. B. in his zealous defence of the ſeparates, in oppoſition to the ſtanding churches, has, I think, entirely forſook his ſubject, and forgot his queſtion. For he ſet out, p. 15, 'To 'open the conſtitution which Mr. F. pleads for, and to prove it 'to be eſſentially different from the firſt churches in this coun-'try, i. e. that the *preſent* ſtanding churches, and the *firſt* are eſſentially different.——In proſecuting which deſign, he tells of many grievous things that have been done, by thoſe of the ſtanding order, in ſending men and women to jail, in one place and another, and confining them there for rates, &c. as in p. 20, 21. and hereupon he adds, at the cloſe of p. 21, '*Theſe* are often 'called *ſtanding churches.*'—Upon which I would juſt remark (before I proceed) that by the relative word *theſe*, he muſt, according to rules of grammar, intend *thoſe* that he had juſt been ſpeaking of, be they what they may: which appear, from the ſeveral paragraphs immediately preceeding, to be the *civil authority* at *New Haven*, *Norwich*, and *Raynham*, and many other places; executing the laws of the *ſtate* upon ſuch as they judged to walk diſorderly, or inconſiſtent with the health and peace of the community. And whether thoſe proſecutions he ſpeaks of, were *fact*, or if *fact*, whether *right* or not, (which is not my buſineſs here to determine) it matters not in the preſent caſe—tis evident they are the doings of the *civil authority*, and of that alone.—So then *Theſe*, viz. the *courts of juſtice*, *civil officers*, &c. ('*Theſe*') are the *churches*, which 'are often called *ſtanding churches.*' And ſo the doings of the civil authority, are charged upon the churches; or rather, the *civil authority* itſelf is called *the church*.—And *ſuch a confounding* of church and ſtate together, I freely grant, 'has done,' or may do 'amazing miſchief in the' *undiſcerning* 'world:' tho' none, I truſt, will be impoſed upon by ſuch an arrant abſurdity, but them that *want diſcerning*; for whoſe ſake I have remarked as above; ſhewing the import of what he *ſays*, tho' perhaps, not what he *means*.

He goes on, p. 21. 'Therefore one deſign of this is, to ſhew 'what they ſtand upon, even—*civil authority.*'—For the ſupport or illuſtration of which (I conclude) he quotes a paſſage in Governor *Hutchinſon's* hiſtory, reſpecting the churches of our fathers;

thers; ſhewing that 'after all that may be ſaid, in favor of the 'conſtitution the ſtrength of it lay in the union declared with the 'civil authority. To preſerve order,' he ſays, 'more than 100 'years ago, in 1653, the general court reſtrained the north church 'in *Boſton* from calling Mr. *Powell* to be their miniſter, who had 'the character of a *well gifted*, but illiterate man. About the 'ſame time, he tells us, they laid a large fine upon the church at 'Malden, for chooſing a miniſter, without the conſent and ap-'probation of the neighbouring churches, and allowance of the 'magiſtrates.'

From hence it appears, that if the *preſent churches* ſtand upon *civil authority*, as Mr. B. I ſuppoſe meant to affirm, even ſo did *the churches of our fathers*: and in this reſpect, he has ſhown, they are *exactly alike*; inſtead of proving an *eſſential difference* between them; which was the point he undertook.

But in truth, neither the former nor preſent churches ſtand upon that feeble baſis, *civil authority*, (but on a better foundation) neither can it be argued that they did, or do now, from the advantage they receive from the *ſtate*, by virtue of their union, any more than that the *woman*, ſpoken of Rev. 12. 16. *Stood upon* the *earth*, (i. e. the church, upon the carnal world) becauſe tis ſaid *the earth helped the woman*.

As to the *miſteps* which the civil authority may happen to make, in their zeal and concern to help the churches, by going beyond their line, (as I ſay not but they did, in the inſtances above,) *that* is no more of an argument againſt the *lawfulneſs* or *expediency* of the *two powers* uniting, than *a woman's uſurping authority over the man*, (which ſometimes happens) by *teaching* and *ruling*, out of her province, is an argument againſt *marriage*, or againſt *both ſexes joining together* in the public worſhip of God.

Thus I think Mr. B. has failed of proving an *eſſential difference*, &c. and of ſhewing that tis unlawful, or wrong, for church and ſtate to unite.

Chapter

Chapter VII.

Wherein it is ſhown that he has miſtaken our Saviour's meaning in Mat. 10. 8. *corrupted the ſenſe of Mat.* 11. 5. *and of Acts* 6. 3. *by adding to* ONE, *and leaving out of the* OTHER, *and failed of confuting the author's ſenſe and application of* 2 *Cor.* 11. 12.

IN p. 24 he tells us that 'Chriſt's ſpecial orders to his firſt miniſters were, *freely ye have received, freely give*:' Which he brings, not only to ſhow that the miniſters of the goſpel ſhould not be maintained by any coercive meaſures, but that they ſhould have no *certain* maintenance at all; or that they ſhould preach the goſpel *freely*, not demanding any wages of the people for their ſervice.

This appears to be his ſenſe of the words above, from his *annexing* and *oppoſing* a quotation out of my ſermons, p. 63—65. where I ſhew, 'that for miniſters to preach freely, without being chargeable to their hearers,—is (extraordinaries excepted) 'an argument why they ſhould be ſuſpected, i. e. of being falſe teachers. Which ſenſe of his is alſo confirmed by his gloſs upon thoſe words, 1 Cor. 9. 14. '*Live of the goſpel*—this is the order 'of it, (ſays he) thoſe whom Chriſt ſends, *profit the people*, and 'the *church becomes bountiful*, and the *fruit* the goſpel produceth 'maintains the preachers of it,' p. 76.

Now, that thoſe words of our Lord, '*freely ye have received*, '*freely give*,' have no reference to *preaching the goſpel*, appears from their connections.—Chriſt's direction to his apoſtles was this, Mat. 10. 7, 8. *And as ye go preach, ſaying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the ſick, cleanſe the lepers, raiſe the dead, caſt out devils: freely ye have received freely give.*

From the 7th v. it appears, that the grand buſineſs they were ſent out upon was, to *preach the goſpel of the kingdom*. The *truths* of which, and alſo their divine *miſſion*, he orders them to confirm by *miracles*, ſaying, *heal the ſick*, &c. *freely ye have received*, &c. plainly ſhewing, that as they had received this gift (or power to work miracles) *freely*, ſo they ſhould uſe it without charge to

thoſe

those whom they healed, i. e. they should not take any thing for casting the devil out of a man. Those words, *freely ye have received freely give*, were evidently spoken with an immediate reference to their *power of working miracles*; and do not respect their *preaching* the gospel of the kingdom; as if *this* was to be done *freely*, i. e. without wages; for *so*, it would be inconsistent with what follows, v. 9. 10. *Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, nor two coats, nor shoes, nor yet staves*; i. e. make no provision at all, for your bodily support, while you are labouring in the gospel ministry: *for*, as he adds in the next words, *the workman is worthy of his meat*. Luke on the same subject, chap. 10. 7. says, *The labourer is worthy of his hire*. Surely these expressions of our Lord, don't look as if he meant that his apostles should *give* their labour *freely*, i. e. that they should take nothing for *preaching*.—Especially if we consider that these two words, *workman* and *labourer*, are elsewhere used of common, *ministerial* labours, where there are no miracles in the question, 2 Tim. 2. 15. *Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth*. 1 Thes. 5. 12. *Know them that labour among you and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you*. 1 Tim. 5. 17. *Let the elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honor, especially they that labour in the word and doctrine*.—These *workmen* and *labourers at preaching*, our Lord tells us, are *worthy of their meat, worthy of their hire*: which makes it the duty of their people, for whom they labour in the gospel, to render it to them *as their due*. Surely then they ought not to be reproached for taking *meat, wages, hire*, which their *master* declares they are worthy of. And he not only said they are *worthy* of it, but has expressly *ordained* that they shall have their *living* by this their *sacred calling*, 1 Cor. 9. 14.——'God's will is the same under the new testament 'that it was under the old; it is not, as to the people, a matter 'of *liberty*, so as men may choose whether they will maintain 'their ministers or not: there is *an ordinance* of God in the case.' See Pool.

And thus our fathers, the first settlers of the country, understood the ministers *right*, and the peoples *duty*. They say expressly, upon 1 Cor. 9. 9—14. and many other texts, that the scriptures 'require this maintenance as a bounden duty, and *due* 'debt; not as a matter of *alms* and *free gift*; therefore people are 'not at liberty to do or not to do *what* and *when* they please in 'this matter, &c.'—That 'the apostle (Gal. 6. 6.) injoining,

'that

'that he which is taught communicate to him that teacheth, *in* 'all good things, doth not leave it *arbitrary*, *what*, or *how much* a 'man shall give, or in what *proportion*, but even the *latter* as well 'as the *former* is prescribed and appointed by the Lord, 1 Cor. '16. 2.—*As God hath prospered him.*' And this is the duty, they say, 'not only of members of churches, but *all that are taught in* '*the word* are to *contribute*,' &c.——That 'the church by her 'power is to *require* it of their members. And when church 'power cannot attain the end, the *magistrate* is to see that the 'ministry be duly provided for: as appears from the commended 'example of Nehemiah, Neh. 13 11.'

These were the sentiments of our pious, meek, and gentle fathers; whose self denying life must certainly exempt them from the many hard reflections that Mr. B. casts upon the *standing* ministers, on account of their support. Yet *they* were so earnest for the ministers *maintenance*, as a *due debt*, by the command of God, that they would have the *civil magistrate* interpose to *oblige* the people that won't do their duty without.—This is *Cambridge Platform*, which our separate brethren profess a high opinion of. p 28, 29, 30. sect. 2, 3, 4.——To which let me add a few passages from the provincial assembly of London.*

'Object. But some may say, the apostles did work, with la-'bour and travel, night and day, that they might not be charge-'able, &c. And if the apostles laboured (i. e. with their hands) 'and had no maintenance, though they were extraordinary, why 'should not other, ordinary ministers labour; and why is their 'maintenance a duty necessary?

'We *answer*, 1. This travel with their own hands, for a sub-'sistence, was a peculiar case of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and was not 'the practice of the other apostles; for *Paul* saith, I *only* and *Bar-'nabas*, have not *we power to forbear working*, as the other apos-'tles and brethren of the Lord and *Cephas?*' Which sense is fairly and even necessarily implied; as appears from 1 Cor. 9 6. compar'd v. 5.

'2. The church's extream necessities; the days of danger and 'exigencies of the saints;—in such case, though *marriage* was 'lawful, I suppose (says *Paul*) it is good for the present distress, 'I say it is good for a man to forbear marriage: and so *Paul* did 'both forbear marriage and also refused maintenance; but none 'can conclude from hence the marriage of ministers is unlawful, 'or their maintenance unneedful.

'3. When

* Jus Divinum, p. 15, 16.

'3. When Paul was necessitated to labour with his hands, he 'numbers it in the catalogue of his sorrows, as part of his sufferings. *To this hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place, and labour working with our own hands*, 1 Cor. 4. 11, 12.

'4. Though Paul refused maintenance, yet he still taught 'believers, that it was a gospel ordinance to maintain their ministers; *for who goeth a warfare at his own charges?* 1 Cor. 9. 7, 14. Shall soldiers have no pay, because when they are lawfully 'called forth, they *offer* themselves *freely* to serve the public? '*Who planteth a vineyard and doth not eat thereof?*

'5. When *Paul*, in the case, and for the reasons abovemen'tioned, refused maintenance, yet he telleth the Corinthians 'that he received much from others; *I robbed other churches, tak'ing wages of them to serve you.*' And he abundantly commend'eth the *Philippians* who were careful for his outward subsistence; 'and their supply sent unto him, he calleth an *odour of a sweet 'smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God.*'——

These things, duly considered, I think must be of weight with every ingenuous mind; nor do I see which way any one, who sees and feels the force of argument and scripture light, can deny that a minister's maintenance is a due debt from a people, to whose service he is wholly devoted; and that they are as much obliged to pay it, as they are any other debt.

In p. 24, bottom, Mr. B. observes, that 'ONE minister has '*lately* found out, that for any to come and profess to *preach the* 'gospel *freely, without being chargeable to the hearers*, is so far from 'being an evidence that they are the *true ministers* of JesusChrist, 'and *sent* by him, that tis (*extraordinaries excepted*) an argument 'why they should be suspected. This' (says he) 'is indeed an 'extraordinary discovery—And it must be acknowleged, that if 'this be a true discovery, we are in a deplorable case; for we 'used to think the gospel's being *freely preached to the poor*, was 'a convincing evidence that the Messiah is come, Mat. 11. 5. 'and if it is not so, we have hitherto been deluded, and must 'look out for new teachings, if not for a new bible.'

Ans. The word *freely*, is not in the text quoted by Mr. B. Mat. 11. 5. Our Lord there only says, *the poor have the gospel preached to them.* And Luke 7. 22. *To the poor the gospel is preached.* Mr. B. has added the word *freely*, I hope not with *design*, but through *inadvertence*. However, since I don't find it corrected among his *Errata*; and since it is a *capital* word, in the present

present dispute—the controversy, in this place, turns upon it, I am therefore obliged to take notice of it; and shall just remark, that if they have no better evidence that their *teaching* is right and their *faith* true than what is founded upon the text above *as Mr. B. reads it*, then they may safely conclude that they 'have 'been hitherto *deluded*—and must look out for *new teachings*, if 'not for a *new bible*;' for they find not in the text he relies on, that the *gospel* was *freely preached to the poor*. And since there are many inattentive readers, in these times, who are peculiarly fond of the doctrine of a *free gospel*, in *his sense*, there is great danger of their taking what he has said *for scripture*; and so of their corrupting the word of God. He adds,

'However, we will endeavor to search our *old bible* a little more, 'before we part with it.'——Ans. By all means; and never entertain a thought of parting with their old bible. But then, let them be very careful that they *read it right*; and think of what vast importance it is, that they *understand* what they read. Men should not search the scriptures *merely* to prove the doctrines which *they* have *embraced*, but search them to find *what doctrines* they *teach*.

Having shown that the meaning of the scripture above, is perverted, by adding a word; before I proceed to the principal thing intended, in this place, I will just shew how another scripture is injured, by his *omitting* several words, on which the point in hand depended.—In his marginal note, p. 24. he insinuates, that I claim 'a power which the apostles never had.' For says he, 'The apostles were only *witnesses* for Christ, and as such, 'pointed out to the church, what qualifications officers should 'have; and said, *Brethren, look ye out among you* such men, Acts '6.'—To which I say, tis evident that Mr. B. there means a power of ordaining officers in the church; by the passage he refers to (in my book p. 17) a few lines above. Which *power* of ordaining, I have said, is given by Christ to *his ministers*. Mr. B. says this is such a 'power as the apostles never had.' And to prove it, brings Acts 6. 3. '*Brethren, look ye out among you*'—and there stops, or leaves the text; keeping back the principal words in the text, as it relates to the present question, (viz.) *seven men*, &c. *whom* WE *may appoint over this business*: plainly shewing that the *apostles*, having directed the multitude of the disciples, (v. 2.) to use their liberty, in choosing out from among themselves, seven men, for deacons, of such qualifications as *they* had prescribed, they (the apostles) challenge, what the brethren did not doubt of, and what I never knew that any *denied*, before Mr.

B. viz the *power* of *ordaining* them, saying, whom WE may APPOINT, &c. *And* (as v 5) *the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they* (the multitude) *chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip,* &c. v. 6. *Whom they* (i. e. the multitude) *set before the apostles.* *And when they* (the apostles) *had prayed, they* (i. e. the same that prayed) *laid their hands upon them,* i. e. appointed them over this business, or ordained them, as they said they would, v. 3.——Now, for Mr. B to leave out of the text these important words, *whom* WE *may appoint over this business,* and tell his readers that the apostles 'were *only witnesses*,' which every one knows are persons that act in a very different character from those who *appoint, set* and *fix* in a station or office, (as the original word signifies) and for him to affirm too that they (the apostles) never had *power* to ordain, is so far from evident truth and fact, and such a presumptuous handling of the holy scriptures ——so daring and manifest a corrupting the sense of them, as I can no ways apologize or account for, in a *sensible* and *good* man. And yet would hope that Mr. B. did not see it, nor design thus grossly *to prevent the right ways of the Lord,* by abusing his sacred oracles.—However, in faithfulness to all who read his *piece* before me, I think it my duty (as I have abundant occasion, from his wresting, or abusing the two passages of scripture above) to caution them all against giving credit to his *reading* or *construing* of scripture, without *seeing for themselves.* For there are many more mistakes, in his book, about the true sense of scripture, than I shall have time to point out.

But the principal thing before us, in his last quotation and reflections thereon, is Mr. B's exposition of 2 Cor. 11. 12. which is now to be examined; and which he opposes to *mine,* given p. 63—65, above.

I agree with him, 'that tis a material point, in order to come 'at the meaning of the text, to know what those false apostles 'gloried in,' p 25.—And I add, tis equally necessary to the same end, to know what it was the apostle *Paul* gloried in: therefore, of this also, in its place.

I have said, the false apostles gloried 'in preaching the gospel '*freely*, without charge to their hearers.'—Mr. B. says quite the contrary. He is very positive that in v. 20, 'Paul is speaking of 'the same persons,' as v. 12.—But here he takes a very material thing for granted, which wants proof. Tis by no means evident, that the same persons are spoken of in v. 20, with those he refers to in v. 12, unless the apostle *there* considers the same persons

acting

acting a contrary part. But there were doubtleſs men of a different character and conduct, among the Corinthians: ſome of which the apoſtle means, v. 20.

Of thoſe in v. 20, 'Paul ſays,' (ſays Mr. B) '*Ye ſuffer if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himſelf,*' (Note, here he ſtops, and I know not why, leaves out the finiſhing ſtroke in their character, viz.) *if a man ſmite you on the face.* He goes on, 'The clauſe, *take of you*, Doctor Gill ſays the Arabic verſion reads, 'took away their goods from them by force. This they did to exalt themſelves.' 'The ways of theſe teachers,' (ſays Mr. B.) 'was to commend themſelves and deſpiſe the apoſtle: his bodily preſence, ſay they, is weak, and his ſpeech contemptible—And his preaching was not with enticing words of man's wiſdom—therefore they deſpiſed him, and commended themſelves,' &c. '*Theſe things ſhew* (ſaye he, p. 26) *what theſe teachers gloried in*'

Reply. That is, according to him, they gloried in bringing the Corinthians *into bondage, in devouring of them, in taking away their goods by force, in exalting themſelves, in ſmiting on the face,* and *deſpiſing the apoſtle.*

Now, Mr. B. will doubtleſs ſay, that *theſe* were very bad things indeed—quite unbecoming the *chriſtian* character, and much more the *apoſtles of Chriſt.* But if his ſenſe of the words be true, i. e. if he has really found out what theſe falſe teachers gloried in, he evidently involves the apoſtles *Barnabas* and *Paul*, under the ſame guilt. For it is quite plain, that theſe falſe apoſtles, by St. Paul's wiſe conduct, would be found to reſemble the true apoſtles—acting juſt like them, in thoſe very things wherein they *gloried.* For the words are, *that wherein* THEY GLORY, *they may be found even as* WE. But Mr. B. ſays, theſe falſe apoſtles gloried in *bringing men into bondage, devouring, taking by force, exalting themſelves*, and (as *Paul* further ſays of them) *ſmiting on the face.* In theſe reſpects then, they were *as* the true apoſtles; and if ſo, then the true apoſtles were, in the ſame reſpects, *even as them*—But ſurely this character illy ſuits the apoſtles *Barnabas* and *Paul.* Mr. B. will by no means allow *them* to be guilty of ſuch ungodly practices. But which way will he clear them? Upon his hypotheſis, that theſe falſe teachers gloried in ſuch things as he has imagined, they are therein even as WE, ſays Paul.

Beſides, the characters in v. 20, will by no means ſuit the character that *Paul* gives of the *falſe teachers themſelves*, to whom he refers,

refers, v. 12. For he evidently ſpeaks of the ſame perſons in the following verſes, 13, 14, 15. For *ſuch* are *falſe* apoſtles——Such as what? Why certainly ſuch as he had juſt ſpoken of v. 12, ſaying, *that I may cut off occaſion from them which deſire occaſion, that wherein they glory they may be found even as we. For ſuch are falſe apoſtles*, &c. So there is no room to doubt, but the ſame perſons ſpoken of in the 12th v. are further deſcribed in the 13th v. and on. But Mr. B. ſays, that Paul ſpeaks of the ſame perſons in the 20th v. whom he ſpeaks of in the 12th. Therefore they that are ſpoken of in the 20th v. muſt be the ſame which are deſcribed in the 13th v. and on, viz. *Falſe apoſtles, deceitful workers, transforming themſelves into the apoſtles of Chriſt. And*, as he adds, *no marvel, for ſatan himſelf is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his miniſters alſo be transformed as the miniſters of* RIGHTEOUSNESS, whoſe end ſhall be according to their works. So that they in the 20th v. are ſuch as *transform themſelves* into the *apoſtles of Chriſt*, and are transformed *as the miniſters of righteouſneſs*, while at the ſame time they *devour rob*, and *fight*; glorying in theſe wicked practices; and are *found even as the true apoſtles*, in thoſe very things wherein they glory.

A ſtrange metamorphoſis indeed! appearing like the *apoſtles* of *Chriſt*—changed as the *miniſters of righteouſneſs*, yet *glorying in their ſhame*, as above; and what is ſtranger ſtill, accompanied by *Paul* and *Barnabas* in the ſame kind of glorying! Surely this expoſition will never ſtand.

But ſays Mr. B p 26 'If they had gloried in preaching for 'nothing, 'tis certain from v 20, that the Corinthians knew that 'they practiſed the contrary: and Paul would not have ſaid '*even as we*, to that.'

Anſ If there be any weight in this argument, it proves that *Paul* in v. 20. ſpeaks of men quite different in conduct from thoſe in v. 12 under conſideration; for tis certain that *theſe* gloried in the very things wherein they were found to act juſt as the apoſtles did, viz in taking no wages of the Corinthians for preaching; for tis certain *this* was the apoſtle's boaſt, v. 10, as ſhall be preſently ſhown more fully.

Doctor Gill's expoſition of the text, which Mr. B. here quotes, appears to me ſo unnatural and inconſiſtent with the context, that I ſhan't ſpend time to examine it, any otherwiſe than by obſerving, as already propoſed:

That the diſpute upon the apoſtle's meaning in this text, may

I apprehend, be brought to a fair and ſpeedy iſſue, by ſettling this one point, viz. what it was that *Paul himſelf gloried in*, as well as what the falſe teachers did; for *Paul* had his *glorying* as well as *they*.

Now, this was, manifeſtly, in his *taking no wages* of the Corinthians for his preaching to them, tho' he took wages of other churches, 1 Cor. 4. 12 *We labour, working with our hands.* And, ſpeaking upon this ſubject, he ſays. 1 Cor. 9. 15. *It were better for me to die, than that any man ſhould make my glorying void.* And v. 9th of this context, *I was chargeable to no man---In all things I kept myſelf from being burthenſome to you, and ſo will I keep myſelf.* And 10 v. *As the truth of Chriſt is in me, no man ſhall ſtop me of this boaſting in the regions of Achaia.*

Thus evident is it, that St. *Paul gloried* in his *preaching the goſpel of God freely to them*, as v. 7.

Now, ſays he, v. 12, *What I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occaſion from them that deſire occaſion*;—plainly ſhewing that the falſe teachers, the miniſters of ſatan, as he calls them v. 14, 15, deſired to find ſome *occaſion* to fault him on account of his *taking wages*. But they could not take occaſion againſt him for his *preaching freely*: for he tells us, he did *this* to *cut off occaſion*; which they would otherwiſe have had, i. e. if he had taken wages. Neither could it have conſiſted with true policy, for him to have *preached freely*, with a view to *cut off occaſion* of offence, had *they taken wages*: for this would naturally have provoked their envy, ſeeing *him* excel *them*, in not being burdenſome to the people, while *they were*.

It remains then (and I cannot ſee any other natural conſtruction of the text) that Paul, ſeeing the popularity of theſe falſe teachers, in preaching *freely* to the Corinthians, as *he* had done from his firſt coming amongſt them, reſolves that he will *continue ſo* to do; and that no man ſhall *ſtop* him, (intimating, that he *had been* in this way; and now he had freſh occaſion or argument, to perſiſt in it, he would not therefore be ſtopped) *of this boaſting; that wherein they* (falſe teachers) *glory*, they may be found even as *we*. For they *both* gloried in the ſame thing, even of preaching the the goſpel *freely*. Paul would not be outdone, by theſe *deceitful workers*. They had nothing to *glory* in, above him: for he was *firſt* and *laſt* in glorying of this, that he had not been chargeable to his people.

Paul had abundantly taught the Corinthians, and preſſed it upon them, that 'twas their duty to ſupport their miniſters; for

ſays

ſays he, 1 Cor. 9. 14. *God has ordained it*: yet for weighty reaſons he exacted nothing of *them*, (tho' he ſought ſupplies of other churches) but piouſly kept himſelf free from being chargeable to them. Theſe falſe apoſtles, deceitfully imitated him, in this reſpect; and ſo were transformed as the apoſtles of Chriſt—taking no wages; tho' miniſters of ſatan, at the ſame time, as v. 14, compared v 15

Mr. B. ſpeaking of my ſenſe of this text, as given in my ſermons, repreſents it as a *late* diſcovery; and that I am *alone* in my ſentiments, p 24, bottom, 'ONE miniſter has LATELY found 'out,' &c.

Reply. An aſſembly of divines, of the firſt rank, of which the learned and pious Mr. *Matthew Pool* (allowed by all to be a judicious expoſitor) was one, (as before noted) about 114 years ago, publiſhed their ſentiments upon this 2 Cor. 11. 12. which (tho' I had not ſeen them when I wrote my book) I now find agreeable to what I have written. Speaking of Paul's preaching *freely* to the *Corinthians*, they ſay,

'This refuſal of maintenance was in caſe of ſcandal, when 'falſe teachers had crept into the church of Corinth, who boaſted 'of themſelves and their own doctrine, and that *they would preach 'the goſpel freely*, and ſo cried down Paul and his miniſtry: therefore, in this caſe *Paul* preached the goſpel freely; *I was chargeable* (ſays he) *to no man; and in all things I have kept myſelf from 'being burdenſome to you; and ſo will I keep myſelf*, v. 9. *And 'what I do*, in this kind, *that I will do*; and the ground of this 'practice he declareth to be, 'to avoid ſcandal; that I may cut 'off occaſion from them which deſire occaſion; and that he might 'ſtop the boaſtings of thoſe falſe apoſtles, deceitful workers, 'transforming themſelves into the apoſtles of Chriſt, that *wherein they gloried they might be found even as we*.'*

So that I am not *alone*; there are more miniſters in the ſcheme than ONE: neither is it a *late* diſcovery—I have written no new thing: tis an *old* and a true doctrine.

He cloſes this head by obſerving, p. 27, 'Mr. F. has unawares 'involved himſelf in a ſad dilemma: for if the caſe be as I have 'repreſented, he ſtands a fair chance of falling among falſe 'teachers.'

Reply. But I think I have proved that Mr. B has repreſented the caſe in a very falſe and injurious light: ſo hope, in the mercy of God, thro' Jeſus Chriſt, that I ſhall not 'fall among falſe teachers,' but ſtand among his true miniſters, tho' the moſt unworthy

* Jus Divinum, p. 15, 16.

worthy and leaſt of all—And I heartily wiſh repentance and ſalvation to Mr. *Backus* alſo.

'But (ſaith he) if *his* ſenſe of the text be right, he ſhews a 'want of Paul's temper, and inſtead of cutting off occaſion of 'being called a *hireling*, he ſtill pleads for that ſcheme, which 'often extorts wages from ſuch as receive no ſervice from them, &c.

Reply. As to this other part of his dilemma, reſpecting *Paul's temper*, I ſhall juſt remark, that *his temper* was truly *chriſtian, meek and gentle*; and he ſhewed it, not only in forbearing to *take wages* of the Corinthians, but alſo in his WRITINGS and whole conduct—And had Mr. B. diſcovered the like *temper* in what *he* has WRITTEN, he might, with a better grace, have reproved his neighbour for *want* of it.—But as to my *temper in taking wages*, &c. I hope I can ſay, that, however defective I am, in every part of ſanctification, yet, were *my* caſe and *people's* like *Paul's*, and the ſtate of the churches *now*, as it was *then*, I know nothing but that, by the grace of God, I ſhould conduct exactly as *he did*. But ſince the caſe of miniſters, churches and people, is entirely different *now*, from what it was in the apoſtle's days, I think Paul's *example*, which was adapted to that day of diſtreſs—infancy of the chriſtian church among the Gentiles, and the prejudices of the Corinthians, by means of *falſe teacher*, who hindred them from doing their duty to miniſters, (I ſay, his *example* in ſuch peculiar circumſtances) is not to be taken as a rule of conduct to us, but rather his *inſtructions* and *commands*, reſpecting this matter, which are obligatory on chriſtians, in every age. And inaſmuch as the apoſtle Paul has repeatedly enjoined it upon people to *ſupport* their miniſters, and ſupply them *with all good things*. Gal. 6. 6. And *this*, as the command of God, 1 Cor. 9 14.—It would certainly have been more for the honor of religion, the peace of the churches, and for his own credit, if Mr. *Backus*, (inſtead of dealing out ſo many hard and dreadful things againſt the miniſters of the goſpel, for *taking* wages of the people) had uſed his beſt influence to convince and ſtir them up to do their duty faithfully, to their miniſters reſpecting their temporalities, according to the will of Chriſt, revealed in his word; and particularly, in preſſing of it upon them as a *moral duty*, to perform the promiſe which they freely and of their own accord have made to their miniſters, for their ſupport; and if not in the very *form* wherein they *firſt* propoſed, yet in *ſuch* form as their *conſcience* beſt approves of; ſo that *the thing* be done—the promiſe made good, without which I ſee not how the *conſcience* can be void of offence.

CHAPTER

Chapter VIII.

His account of Mr. Woodward, *of Norwich, corrected; with some remarks on his quotations from Mr. Tennant.*

A Difficulty arising between Mr. *Woodward* (formerly minister at *Norwich*) and his people, on account of the form of church discipline; the matter was refered to a council, and Mr. Woodward was dismissed,—Upon this affair Mr. B. observes, p. 29, bottom, 'However, after many councils and much fatigue, a 'sum of money prevailed with *that minister* to quit his place.'—— Taking this representation to be truly made, I think we must necessarily conclude, that the point of his removal was gained by a *sum of money*, i. e. he was *hired* to leave the place. Whereas the fact was really this, as I have it from good authority. —— 'He (Mr. Woodward) was dismissed, by council, in regular state. 'The *sum of money* he received, when he left the town, was *only* 'for his temporal interest *therein*, which fetched the purchasers 'of it the sum they gave, with advance.——And what more common or innocent than this? What shadow of occasion was there given, in this affair, to traduce that gentleman with being servile or mercenary in his conduct? Why must his ashes be disturbed, and his children grieved by an odious character fastened upon him, without any motive but what existed in the unfriendly pen that drew it?

But not content with slurring the *dead*, the *living* also must share the like fate.—His marginal note upon *the sum of money*, above, p. 29, viz. 'And rarely can any society now get rid of a '*bad minister*, but by *that means*;' (this I say) is so void of decency and of every thing that is *Christlike*—such a manifest and gross violation of all the laws of humanity and religion, that I shan't detain the reader with any arguments, to shew how base and injurious the insinuation is: but, for the author's conviction and repentance, shall only turn him to Mat. 7. 2. *With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.*

The respectful notice that I take of the Rev. Mr. *Gilbert Tennant*, in my sermons, p. 114, (which I suppose to be just, so far as I touched his labours *among us*, to which I refered; not hearing him myself, but had my account from some that did) gives Mr. B. occasion, it seems, to turn my author against me; by quoting several bitter passages, out of his famous *Nottingham sermon*, wherein

wherein the *body* of the *clergy*, in that day, are represented as men of a very infamous character, p 33 —And, from another hand, collected out of the same sermon, I find above thirty stinging epithets—hard and dreadful names, given by Mr. T. to the ministers of those times; which are so unbecoming a christian writer, that I forbear to transcribe them, lest I should seem (unnecessarily) willing to spread the knowlege, and help to perpetuate the memory of things, so justly offensive, that they ought rather to be buried in silence and forgetfulness.

Wherefore, omitting many things which I have at hand to offer, (there not being room to enlarge under this head) I shall, to silence Mr. B. and all the friends to that defamatory sermon, only turn them to what Mr. *Tennant* himself printed, in his three sermons against the *Moravians*, preached at *New-York*, in 1742, a little after his *Nottingham* sermon; and also to a pamphlet entitled *Gilbert* against *Tennant*, printed in 1743, signed *Philalethes*. Wherein they will find that Mr. Tennant at *New-York* said many things, either directly contrary to, or inconsistent with, what he had said in his *Nottingham* sermon, respecting the *ministers* and *separations*. And so his sermons at *New York*, must be looked upon, either as a designed retractation of his former errors, or else as an accidental confutation of himself. Which is enough to confound their building of the separations upon *his* favorable opinion of them, as justly occasioned by the corruption of the clergy of those times.—For if they believe and follow Mr. *Tennant* at *New York*, they must give up the point in controversy—cease from their separations, and attend upon the preaching of the standing ministers. But if they adhere to Mr. *Tennant* at *Nottingham*, they will have Mr *Tennant* at *York* directly against them: and so the same authority that builds them up in *one* sermon, pulls them down in *others*; wherein he implicitly calls them, 'proud separatists like the pharisees of old.'—And what is this but to demolish the work of his own hands, and so destroy his own authority?—Which shows, that Mr *Tennant's* severe sentiments of the ministers of those times, are but a poor founda- to build the modern separations upon. And therefore it must be very rash and injudicious, for people to encourage and support themselves, in drawing off from the regular ministers and churches of Christ, upon an authority so weakened, as the above, especially in the case before us.

'Tis with a sensible regret that I speak thus of that worthy, good gentleman: nor should I have mentioned these things, had

not the cause of Christ, as I apprehend, required it in the present dispute.——But great and good men (among whom Mr. Tennant, as I suppose, may justly be ranked) are not to be followed nor countenanced, when, thro' the influence of a false spirit, they are betrayed into errors.

Chapter IX.

His account of Mr. Cogswell's ordination corrected—ministers right of examining candidates defended—his criticism on the words in and over *the church examined—his notion of voters in parish meetings corrected.*

MR. B. tells us, p 38, that the first of their separate churches was at *Canterbury*; and that it was occasioned by the ordination of Mr. *Cogswell* there,——

And according to his account of the matter, *that* part of the church which adhered to Mr. *Cogswell*, and joined the society in calling and settling of him, did, 'under the direction' of the *consociation*, 'renounce the former principles of the church, and put 'themselves under the *Say-Brook* regulation.'—Necessarily implying, that, till then, the church at *Canterbury* was not under *Say Brook*, but some other regulation, viz. as he tells us p. 39, upon the congregational plan: and so, that the members which clave to Mr. *Cogswell*, were *separates* from the church, and not *they* that opposed his ordination.

But I find a different account of that affair, by the result of the consociation council, called to ordain Mr. *Cogswell*, *Canterbury*, December 26, 1744, and by some other papers.

After hearing all pleas, &c. and inspecting the affairs of the church, from their beginning, they say, 'It appears to the coun-'cil, that the church in *Canterbury* have, by their usage and 'practice heretofore, (whatever their private sentiments were) 'declared themselves a church under Say Brook regulation, and 'acting in conformity to it, from time to time, during Mr. *Eastbrook's* life' their first minister.—And upon a critical examination of what passed while Mr. *Jenison* was among them, as also the doings of the church, under Mr. *Wadsworth's* ministry, the *council* further say, 'It does not appear to us, that ever there was 'any vote of the church, *acting as a church*, or any covenant or 'agreement recorded or taken care of, *by them*, that can be evi-

'dential,

'dential, that they were a *congregational* church, according to 'Cambridge platform: and the known, ordinary practice and 'usage of the church, seems to determine the contrary; altho' 'the sentiments of *many* or *most* of the church members, might 'have been for *Cambridge* platform.'

The council further say, 'From the papers and transactions of 'the people here, laid before us, we think it plainly appears that 'the antient, proper church members of the church in *Canterbury*, 'are divided into two parties, and, as far as they can, have formed themselves into two churches: a number of them having 'declared against and gone off from their former usage and 'practice, and declared themselves a congregational church, according to Cambridge platform, and taken upon them to admit 'members, and deal with their brethren who are differently perswaded &c.'—'The *rest* abiding by Say Brook regulation, and 'resolving to act and conform themselves to it in matters of discipline.'

It appears to the council, 'that a very great majority of the '*society* had called Mr. Cogswell to be their minister, and were 'satisfied with him, as also the *church* who adhere to their former 'usage,' as 'they have right by the law of nature and of our 'Lord Jesus Christ' to do; and it appearing also to the council, 'that Mr. Cogswell (the person they had called) was competently 'qualified with gifts, and, in a judgment of charity, with the 'grace of God's holy Spirit, for the work of the ministry,' they proceeded to ordain 'Mr. *James Cogswell* a minister of the gospel, 'unto the society and the christian people, who have called him, 'and who shall willingly put themselves under his ministerial 'care.'——Having first declared, 'We don't pretend to force or 'impose him upon the congregational and dissenting brethren of 'this place, who have right to judge and choose for themselves 'as to a minister, tho' they have no right to asperse or reproach 'any man.'——They also observe, 'We have—advised the 'church and people who have called Mr. Cogswell to the work 'of the ministry, to declare their willingness that their brethren, 'who dissent from them, should be a society by, and settle the 'ordinances of the gospel among themselves; and that they 'should not pretend, by any means to compel and force them, to 'put themselves under Mr. *Cogswell's* ministry, or fall in with 'their agreement, respecting church discipline, nor pretend to use 'any force to oblige them to attend Mr. Cogswell's ministry, 'nor use any coercive measures with them on that account,' &c.

All

All which the ſociety did, at a meeting for that purpoſe, during the council's ſitting, by vote declare their compliance with. They add, 'And we of this council do declare, that we ſhall 'willingly aſſiſt in what we lawfully can do, to obtain for them from 'the general aſſembly a diſcharge and releaſe from this ſociety,' &c. 'or being obliged to pay any thing towards the ſupport of Mr. 'Cogſwell, and that they may have all legal privileges of a diſ-'tinct religious ſociety.'—And accordingly, 'the moderator and 'ſcribes were choſen and appointed, by the council, to act in 'their name, in repreſenting the affair of the congregational and 'diſſenting brethren, to the general aſſembly, and, *whenever they* '*are deſired*, to do according to the above declaration of the 'council,' &c.

Such were the judicious proceedings, cautious ſteps and gentle meaſures of the council, with reſpect to the ordination of Mr. *Cogſwell*; and ſuch the ſtate and proceedings of the church and ſociety, which called him to the goſpel miniſtry among them; as repreſented in the reſult of council.—And from hence it appears, that Mr. *Backus* is miſtaken, and has given a wrong account of that affair in the following particulars, viz. In ſaying p. 38, that 'after the *church* in *Canterbury* had made trial of him, (Mr. Cogſwell) 'they judged him to be deſtitute of thoſe eſſential qua-'lifications that ought to be in a miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt, and 'therefore refuſed to join with the ſociety in their choice.'—— Note, It was but a *part* of the church that *ſo* judged and refuſed; and *that* part *only* which, a little before, (viz. Jan. 27, 1743, not two years) 'had declared againſt and gone off from their former 'uſage and practice:' the *other part* of the church, remaining under *Say Brook*, did not judge as *they* did, nor act with *them*, but with the ſociety.

'Though they had voted with them before—it is declared that 'they acted in *that vote* by ſurprize, and not underſtanding what 'they did, nor what was contained in Cambridge platform, and 'which they repented of as ſoon as they knew how their bre-'thren underſtood it, and what practice they thought it gave 'them right to,' (as the council further obſerve) 'and ſo they 'returned to their antient uſage according to Say-Brook regula-'tion'

Again, 'twas wrong in Mr. B. to ſay, 'After the conſociation 'was called, and under *their direction*, a number of the members 'openly *renounced* the *former principles* of the *church*, and put 'themſelves under *Say-Brook* regulation;'—For theſe brethren did

did not *renounce* the *former principles* of the church, but openly declared for them, and adhered to them, if the church's *former principles* may be known by their *former usage* and *practice*: which alone gives us a visible right to judge by:—that is, they declared themselves to be under *Say Brook* regulation, as the church, when altogether, had *practised* from the beginning —— Neither was *this* done under the *direction* of the *consociation council*: for tho' they might *renewedly* make such a declaration, before that council, yet in fact they had done it a month before the council met, viz. on the 27th of November; as the committee from that part of the church that opposed Mr. *Cogswell's* settling, complained to the council, in one of their pleas, viz. that 'the '27th of November last, sixteen (i. e. of the church) withdrew 'from the rest, and voted Mr. James Cogswell their pastor.'— So that it was their own voluntary act, to declare, that they would be under *Say Brook* regulation, in the designed settlement of Mr. *Cogswell*, according to their former usage; and this happened, as above, on the 27th November, preceding the 26th December 1744, when the *consociation* convened: and so this *open renouncing*, as Mr. B. speaks, was not under their direction.

He then tells us that those of the church who chose Mr. *Cogswell* and 'got him ordained as their minister—afterwards sent 'some of the members of the church to prison, for not attending 'on his ministry.'——But this appears altogether improbable, as it would be acting directly contrary to the advice of the council, as above related. And besides, by a letter from one upon the *spot*, and who was well acquainted with these things, living among them in all those times, and whose account, as follows, may be relied on; speaking of the fact above, as related by Mr. B. he says, 'It is not true, so far as I can have any remembrance: and all 'the civil authority, then in the *town*, assure me there was no such 'thing.———But supposing some *justice* in town had sent a 'number to jail, why is Mr. *Cogswell's church* charged with the 'guilt of it? To support such a charge, it would have been 'very seasonable for Mr. B. to have produced the *church mittimus*. 'There was, indeed, one person sent to jail, while Mr. *Cogswell* 'was a candidate here; not because he did not attend *worship*, 'but because on a lecture day, after exercise, in full assembly, he 'charged him with *blasphemy*, and used a great deal of opprobri-'ous language of the same kind. Two more were committed 'afterwards, for such boisterous carriage, at a *funeral*, as plainly 'amounted to a breach of the peace.

These,

These, I am informed, are all the instances of persons sent to jail for things of this nature, tho' many others, 'tis said, were guilty of the like *kind* of conduct.

Mr. B adds, 'yea, and threatned to prosecute Mr. *Buel* for 'staying in the town to preach the gospel upon the desire of many 'members of the church, without the *vote* of the society.'

This I am well assured is without foundation. By the letter above it appears, 'That Mr. *Buel* never was, save *once*, in the 'town, after Mr. *Cogswell* was settled *here*, for a number of years; 'and then only tarried to preach one lecture, in compliance with 'Mr. *Cogswell*'s invitation —— When Mr. *Cogswell* first came to 'Canterbury, he visited Mr. *Buel*, then sick at Capt. *Johnson's*; 'Mr. *Buel* advised him by all means to tarry and preach; and 'further told him, he had no thoughts of preaching in the society any more.'

'Here reader is the plain state of *our first separate churches*,' (says Mr. B. p. 39, top) 'It is the *first* church in *Canterbury*.' — Not so; but (as appears from the result of council already produced) a *part* of the first church there, who had, then lately voted themselves *congregational* under Cambridge platform, different from the former usage and practice of the church, which, till *then*, had been according to *Say-Brook*.

'Who (says Mr B) retain their antient *principles*, their *records* and other *furniture* of the *church*.'

Anf. If their *antient principles* were secret, Mr. B. may be right: but if they were to be judged of by their *practice*, they do not *retain* them, but renounced them in Jan 1743.

'As to the church *records*, indeed, they have them in possession; as they happened to fall into the hands of a person, who 'would not deliver them up without trouble; and the book being obtained long enough to take a copy of the records, neither 'Mr. *Cogswell* nor his church thought the thing of importance 'enough to contend about.'

And 'as to the church utensils; as the church was about 'equally divided by the separation, both parties agreed to divide 'them equally.'

'And are called *separate* (says Mr. B) *only* because they refused 'to give up their *judgments* to the *clergy* and the *world*, in so 'important an affair as the choice of a *guide for their souls*.' —— This is most ungenerous and far from *truth*, tho' I hope undesignedly. They are not called *separate* for not giving up their judgments to the *clergy* and *world*. For the *clergy* (if the *council*

comes

comes under that character) expreſly declare, in their reſult concerning thoſe called congregational, in *Canterbury*, 'that they 'have right to judge and chooſe for themſelves, as to a miniſter, 'tho' they have no right to aſperſe or reproach any man;' and the council diſclaimed 'all pretence to force or impoſe' a miniſter upon them.—And if by '*the world*,' he means the ſociety and church that choſe and ſettled Mr. Cogſwell, he greatly injures them; in that it appears, by the foregoing account, that *they* freely voted their *willingneſs* that their diſſenting brethren, ſhould 'be releaſed and diſcharged from paying any thing to the ſupport of Mr. Cogſwell, or being under his miniſtry.' Which neceſſarily implies that they had no deſire or thought that their brethren ſhould *give up their judgments to them*, in the important affair of *chooſing a guide*, &c. And as to their religious conduct, in the whole affair, there is nothing that appears in *them*, to denominate them the *world*, any more than in their brethren that are called, *the church*.

His ſaying, 'whereas the very act of this church, which they 'are *condemned* for, was adhering to the *congregational plan*,' is directly contrary to all the proceedings of the council, church and ſociety towards them, as above related. They are not once *condemned*, by *council*, nor their *brethren*, nor by any mortal, 'for adhering to the *congregational plan*;' for the ſociety freely conſented to their going off and being by themſelves; and the *council* generouſly offered their beſt ſervices, to promote their intereſt and peaceable enjoyment of all church privileges, in *that way* which they had choſen, i. e. upon the *congregational plan*.—— 'Tis ſaid indeed that Mr B. lays no reſtraint on his pen!

He further ſays, 'All the ſettled miniſters of the county left 'the *church*.' p. 39 —— To this I reply, 'The truth was,' (ſays my informer above) 'that as they profeſſed themſelves a *congregational church*, &c. the council offered to aſſiſt them, *whenever* '*they ſhould be deſired*, in obtaining ſociety privileges, as the reſult 'ſhows: but this they never deſired; nor indeed ever aſked 'any ſuch thing of the general aſſembly; but ſet themſelves in 'avowed oppoſition to the ſtanding churches, with other ſepa-'rates'—— And for the truth of what is laſt ſaid, Mr. B helps me to full proof, by informing, p. 39, 'that after their own paſ-'tor (Mr. *Pain*) was ordained, he was proſecuted and fined, for 'marrying a couple, becauſe they would not allow him to be 'truly ordained.'—— But this would never have happened, had he been a regular paſtor, over a regular ſociety and church, upon

the

the true congregational plan, which that church profeſſed to ſet out upon: but ſetting up, not upon the proper congregational, but *ſeparate plan*, in oppoſition to the ſtanding churches, their *paſtor* was not an officer known, either in church or ſtate; and therefore liable to be proſecuted and fined. For if he was not an officer in the church, according to the *conſtitution* of the country, which the ſeparates entirely diſclaim, then tis plain that he had no right, by any law of the government, to marry people.— Thus I have ſhown how different Mr. B's account of their firſt ſeparate church, and the proceedings at *Canterbury*, is from fact or the true ſtate of things *there*. And this may ſerve as a general caution to his readers, how they receive and rely upon his account of things in other parts of his book; the moſt of which that remain, I ſhall be obliged to paſs over, having doubly exceeded my intended bounds already.

To proceed——

Mr. B. further back, p. 36, had obſerved, as an evidence of my boaſting of our miniſterial qualifications, that 'I had told a long 'ſtory of, how I and my brethren preached much better than the 'ſeparates.' &c.

He has not pointed to the page of my book, where the *long ſtory is told*, and I know not where it is, nor do I remember any thing of it. But muſt confeſs that if I have any where made *this* my *boaſt*, it is ſo inglorious, that it deſerves a ſevere reproof.

But what he charges as a great fault, is 'miniſters arrogating 'a power to *try* and *approbate miniſters* wholly to themſelves.'— And, ſays Mr. B. Mr. *Fiſh* ſays, 'the *qualifications* of *teachers*, are 'to be judged of by the miniſters of Chriſt.'

Anſ. True I have ſaid ſo; and do think that the ſcriptures cited to confirm it, p 147 my book,* do neceſſarily imply the doctrine: neither has Mr. B. ſaid one word to ſhew that it is not contained in thoſe ſcriptures.—Tho' I no where deny the right of *people* to try, judge, and chooſe for themſelves, but plead for it.

Indeed Mr. B. obſerves, 'that thoſe epiſtles (to Timothy and 'Titus) were to direct miniſters concerning their behaviour IN 'the *church*, not OVER it,' which I ſuppoſe he intends as an anſwer to what I have aſſerted.

Reply. This is a manifeſt evaſion; and touches not the point. For miniſters examining and judging of the qualifications of candidates,

* Tit. 1. 5 to 12. 2 Tim. 2. 1, 2. 1 Tim. 3. 10. compar'd with foregoing context.

didates, may belong to, and be a part of their *behaviour* IN the church, for aught Mr. B. has ſaid to confute it. And ſo the doctrine of my book ſtands right, till he has ſhown it to be falſe.

But his criticiſm upon the words IN and OVER the church, is ſomewhat ſingular. 'Tis plain that by *this* he inſinuates, that miniſters may not think themſelves to be *rulers over* the church—this is arrogance. I would by no means claim any *rule* or *authority in* or *over* the church, which the great *Head* has not given: But Mr. B. ſurely, would not take *that* from us, which Chriſt has given to us. His *criticiſm* has no place in the ſacred texts.

'Tis plain, that when a miniſter is fixed *in* a church, and taught how to *behave* himſelf *in* it, he is, at the ſame time, ſet *over it*; as this ſame apoſtle (who writes to Timothy and Titus) elſewhere teaches, 1 Theſ. 5. 12, 13. *We beſeech you brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are* OVER *you in the Lord, and admoniſh you. And to eſteem them very highly in love for their works ſake.* Heb. 13. 7. *Remember them which have the rule* OVER *you, who have ſpoken to you the word of God.* v. 17. *Obey them that have the rule* OVER *you, and ſubmit yourſelves, for they watch for your ſouls.* And thus Paul talks in his epiſtle to Timothy, 1 Tim. 5. 17. *Let the elders that* RULE *well*, &c.—*eſpecially they that labour in word and doctrine* ——Surely theſe paſſages relate to miniſters, and evidently give them the RULE OVER the church of Chriſt.

But ſays Mr. B. 'Our Lord commends the church of Epheſus, 'becauſe *they had tried them which ſaid they were apoſtles, and* 'were not, *and had found them liars*, Rev. 2. 2.

Anſwer. Theſe words were ſpoken *to* and of the *angel* or *miniſter* of the church of Epheſus, v. 1. *Unto the angel of the church of Epheſus*, &c. That church had a *miniſter* over it, to rule, lead and guide it, in all its ſpiritual affairs. And I hope Mr. B will allow the *angel* or *miniſter* to have had *ſome* hand at leaſt, in the examination of thoſe falſe apoſtles. There is a wide difference between a church *organized*, i. e. a church with a qualified *miniſter* at the head, to guide them in all their difficult affairs, and the good *brotherhood* alone, or without ſuch a head.

For want of viewing the churches in this light, as they are ſpoken of in ſcripture, at leaſt frequently, as having *paſtors* to guide them, the *brotherhood* are in danger of *arrogating* to themſelves a *power* which the Lord has not given them.

No miniſter among us, that I ever heard of, pretends that the fraternity have not a right to *try* and *ſatisfy* themſelves about

the *qualifications* of the man that is to be choſen for their guide, in the affairs of their ſouls: but all recommend it as their duty. But at the ſame time, the goſpel furniture of an *able* and *faithful* miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt, in its full latitude, is above the reach of common people Very dangerous and pernicious errors, may lie ſo deep and concealed, as to require much reading and penetration to diſcover them, which common brethren ordinarily have not: and needful accompliſhments of *learning*, can be judged of by none but ſuch as are *themſelves* thus accompliſhed. Hence is mere vanity in the brotherhood, to think *themſelves* equal to it, or that they ſhould chooſe to have ſo critical and important an affair left with them. Let them aſſiſt us what they can, in things within their reach: We ſhall be thankful to them for their help. But let them not *exerciſe themſelves in things too high for them.*—Since our Lord has directed *us*, the miniſters of the goſpel, to *commit* the work of it to *able* and *faithful* men, (2 Tim. 2. 2) which neceſſarily implies, that we ſhould *examine*, *try* and *prove* them, (or we cannot judge of their *ability* and *faithfulneſs*) it follows that *this* matter belongs to *us*: and when we have done our duty, to the beſt of our ability, the people are at liberty whether they will chooſe them or not.

So that, on the whole, altho' we think the affair of examination and judging of the qualifications of candidates for the miniſtry, is committed to the *miniſters*, by the head of the churches, yet we neither *arrogate* it *wholly* to ourſelves, as Mr. B. charges, i. e. ſo as to exclude the people from trying and judging and chooſing for themſelves; nor do we ever pretend to *impoſe* upon *them*, thoſe whom we examine and approbate.

But ſays Mr. B. p. 40, top, 'Paul expreſly ſhows that letters 'of *commendation*, in his time, were *To* and *From* the *church*.'

Reply. Tho' the word *church* is not in the text—tis to *you*, and from *you*; yet allowing the apoſtle meant the Corinthian churches; What then? The ſubject we are upon is that of examining and approbating the *preachers* of the goſpel. And the queſtion is, whether this belongs to the church, i. e. the *fraternity*, or to the *miniſters*. Mr. B. ſuppoſes it belongs to the *former*, and brings the words above to prove it. But did the Corinthian church examine *Paul* and *Barnabas*, (as *they* were commonly together) to ſee if they were qualified for the *apoſtleſhip*? *They* ſurely had their commiſſion and approbation from a higher board.——But allowing that the Corinthian churches *examined* Paul and other apoſtles and miniſters, and recommended them to

other

other churches, having judged their qualifications equal to the work of the miniſtry (which don't appear from the text) will that prove his point, that the *brotherhood* ſhall *examine* and *approbate* the *candidate* for the miniſtry among them, *without* the guidence of *miniſters*? Surely no: for theſe Corinthian churches were full of *miniſters*. And ſo if letters of commendation went *from* them or came *to* them, 'twill be hard for Mr. B. to prove that the *brotherhood* and *not* the *miniſters gave* and *received* them; without which 'tis nothing to his purpoſe. So that his capitals TO and FROM *the church*, avail him nothing in the preſent diſpute.

One remark more ſhall cloſe this chapter. Mr. B. to ſhew his contemptuous thought of our conſtitution, calls the legal *voters* in our pariſh meetings, when a *miniſter* is in the queſtion, by the ignominious name of *The World*; and yokes the *clergy* with them, p. 39. 'Called *ſeparate* only becauſe they refuſed to give 'up their judgments to the *clergy* and the WORLD,' in the affair of chooſing a *miniſter*. In the margin he explains himſelf, p. 39. 'I ſay the *world*; for the law requires no other qualification to 'make a *voter* in *their pariſhes*, but a certain quantity of worldly 'eſtate.'

Anſwer. Yes, there is one qualification more. If a man is in *full communion* with the church, he is a legal voter in pariſh meetings, tho' he has no worldly eſtate at all. And all others of the *church* give their *votes* in pariſh meetings, becauſe they are qualified according to law, by means of their *worldly eſtates*. So that whenever the *members of the church* do vote, in pariſh meetings, whether they have *nothing* or *ſomething* of *worldly eſtate*, they vote as perſons qualified *by the law of the conſtitution*. Whereas a man that is not one of the church, nor has a ſufficiency of *worldly eſtate*, is not allowed to *vote*. So that the church has the advantage of the *world*, in Mr. B's ſenſe of the word. And 'tis well known, that there are no men among us, more ready than the *ſeparate* churches and people are, to take the advantage which the *law* gives them, i. e. *worldly eſtate*, by voting in our pariſh meetings, when they think fit.—And this leaves no room to doubt, whether the *poor* of *their churches* would not vote in pariſh meetings, as *ours* do, did *their churchmemberſhip* entitle them to it, by *law*, as it does *ours*.——Be that as it will, his argument falls very heavy upon the *ſeparates*, (if he gives the *voters* in our *pariſhes* a right name, viz. *the world*) for it brings *them* in with *us*, to be the conſtituents of the *world*; for *all* vote, in our

pariſhes,

pariſhes, as men *qualified by law*. And as he brings in the *clergy* with the *world* (no one can think, *from his book*, but) with a deſign to do them a miſchief, he makes a terrible overthrow; ſlaying *clergy* and *laity*, *ſtanding churches* and *ſeparates*, all with one ſtroke. But no matter for that——If the *miniſters* and their *churches* may but fall, he ſeems willing that *he* and his *brethren*, *Sampſon-like*, ſhould *die with the Philiſtines*.

Chapter X.

Wherein his charge againſt the miniſters, 'that 'they aſſiſted in cauſing a diviſion in the church 'of Canterbury,' is conſidered; and the author's ſenſe of Iſa. 50. 4. defended againſt his exceptions—His charge of Arianiſm, *groundleſs.*

THE miniſters, ſays Mr. B. (p. 40) 'aſſiſted in cauſing a *diviſion* in the *church* of *Canterbury*, becauſe they' (the church) 'would not ſubmit to that power' (which he ſaid, before, they had 'arrogated, to try and approbate miniſters') con-'trary to the doctrine which they had learned in the goſpel.'

Reply. If Mr. B. means that the miniſters aſſiſted in cauſing that diviſion, by *ordaining* Mr. *Cogſwell*, whom they had approved of, and whom the ſtanding part of the church and ſociety had choſen and called to be their miniſter, (as I think he muſt do) it is a very great miſtake; as appears from his own account, p. 38. 'The *church*' (ſays he) 'at length withdrew, and met at a private 'houſe. *After which*, the conſociation was called.' Plainly ſhewing, that *after* they had withdrawn, or ſeparated themſelves from their brethren, the conſociation, which ordained Mr. *Cogſwell*, was called.

So that the *diviſion* was made *among themſelves*, on account of their not agreeing with their brethren, in the choice and call of a paſtor. For he ſays, p. 38, 'The *church*—refuſed to join 'with the ſociety in their choice—at length withdrew—*after* 'which the conſociation was called,' &c. Which ſhows that the *diviſion*, which he ſpeaks of, was made *before* the miniſters (i. e. of the conſociation) acted in their caſe. And therefore the miniſters could not juſtly be charged with *cauſing* of it.

How then could Mr. B. with any propriety or good conſcience, apply to the miniſters thoſe words of the apoſtle, Rom. 16 17, 18. and ſay, p. 40, 'Here therefore the text, which they often caſt

'upon

'upon us, is ſtrictly applicable to them. *Mark them* which 'cauſe *diviſions* and offences, *contrary to the doctrine which ye have* 'learned, *and* AVOID *them*: for they that are ſuch *ſerve not our* 'Lord Jeſus Chriſt, but *their* OWN *belly*; and by *good words* and '*fair ſpeeches* DECEIVE the hearts of the ſimple.' I leave it with Mr. B. to conſider how he will anſwer, to the *Chief Shepherd*, ſuch an abuſe of his miniſters and of the holy ſcriptures.

Under his head of *Learning*, p. 43, 44. he aſks, 'What ſhall 'we think of our author upon this point? Speaking of miniſters 'work, he ſays, our Lord hath ſhewn us that *learning* is emi-'nently uſeful, yea even *neceſſary*. Iſa. 50. 4 *The Lord God hath* 'given me the tongue of the learned, that I ſhould know how to ſpeak 'a word in ſeaſon to him that is weary. Intimating that he ſhould 'not have known *how* without a learned tongue, p. 175.—— 'When I read this (ſays Mr. B.) I confeſs it cauſed this enquiry 'in my mind, If Mr Fiſh knows no better than to conſtrue this 'ſcripture ſo, where is his learning? And if he does, where is 'his honeſty? His controverſy with us, is about *human learning*; 'whereas that text expreſſeth *divine learning* as plain as words 'can poſſibly do. And there is great reaſon to hink that the 'prophet here perſonates *Him*, who tho' he were a ſon,' &c.

Reply. Our controverſy is indeed about *human learning*; and if there is nothing of *that*, in the text before us, I have, doubtleſs, miſapplied the words.——But *of whom ſpeaketh the prophet this? Of himſelf, or of ſome other man?* I confeſs I took him to be ſpeaking of the *Man Chriſt Jeſus*; and that he ſpake *here*, of Chriſt's *manhood*, and not directly of his *Godhead*, or divine nature, tho' in union therewith. And the form of expreſſion, in the text, perfectly agrees with Chriſt's manner of ſpeaking, when he ſpake of himſelf, as to his *human nature*. The *Lord God hath given* me the *tongue*, &c. Agreeable to Chriſt's words reſpecting his *manhood*, John 17. 7, 8. *They have known that all things whatſoever thou* (the Father) *haſt* GIVEN *me, are of thee. For I have given* unto them the words which thou *gaveſt me*. As *God*, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt had an infinite fullneſs in himſelf. As *Man*, he received all from the Father, by the anointing of the Holy Spirit; *for God giveth not the Spirit by meaſure unto him*, Joh. 4 34. Now, view the man Chriſt Jeſus, as filled with the Holy Spirit, which the Father *gave* him not by meaſure and we ſhall find every thing in him, which is contained in the word *learning*, or a *learned tongue*.—Tho' he did not get this learning in the way of laborious ſtudy, as weak and ſinful mortals do: but by way of immediate

immediate gift from the *Father*, when he anointed him with the *Spirit*; yet the *manner* of his receiving this *learning* or knowlege, does not alter the *nature* of it; 'tis *human learning* ſtill; and Chriſt, *as man*, had all that is contained therein; that he might be able, in the fitteſt manner, to addreſs himſelf to weary and diſtreſſed ſouls.

The learned and judicious Mr. *Pool*, thus expounds the words, *The Lord God hath given me*, 'This (ſaith he) and the following 'paſſages may be, in ſome ſort, underſtood of the prophet *Iſaiah*, 'though but obſcurely and imperfectly: but they are far more 'evidently and eminently verified in Chriſt, and indeed ſeem to 'be meant directly of him. *The tongue of the learned*—This '(ſays he) imports an ability of ſpeaking *plainly*, *convincingly*, 'and *perſwadingly*.'——'*Plainly*'—This holds forth every thing that is contained in *grammar*, or the right uſe of ſpeech and knowlege of the tongues.——'*Convincingly*'—This comprehends every thing that *logic*, or the right uſe of *reaſon* teaches and contains. For rational beings are convinced by the Spirit of God, in a rational way, by rational arguments. *As* Paul *reaſoned* of righteouſneſs, &c. *Felix trembled*.——'*Perſwadingly*'—Here we have that noble branch of *human learning* called *Rhetorick*, an art to enforce obedience to precepts, moral or divine, by arguments and motives that are well adapted to engage the attention, alarm the conſcience, overcome the will, captivate the affections, and enliſt all the powers of the underſtanding into the cauſe depending; and ſo, to win over the whole ſoul, by a hearty conſent, to engage in the ſervice propoſed, or to embrace the object preſented before us.—— All this, In which the excellency of *human learning* conſiſts, is evidently imported in that comprehenſive phraſe, *The tongue of the learned*, as the judicious Pool expounds it.

Not that I meant, or do now mean, that the paſſage before us intends *nothing* elſe but *human learning*: far from it. Though I know not what Mr. B. intends, particularly, by *divine learning*, (for his ideas are very ſingular) nor can I ſee how the text, in hand, expreſſeth *ſuch learning*, excluſive of *human*, 'as plainly 'as words can poſſibly do,' as he talks; yet, as the great expoſitor above goes on, ſo I freely concur with him, that the phraſe alſo imports an ability of ſpeaking, 'in all points, as becometh a 'perſon taught of God, and filled with all divine and heavenly 'wiſdom and knowlege, and a ſingular ſkill of winning ſouls and 'working upon men's hearts and conſciences.'—Theſe things I

own

own are included or suggested to us, by the prophet, in this scripture, tho' more remotely: the *first* and most obvious import of the word, is in favor of *human learning*; which is as much the gift of God, in its place, as grace to improve it to the glory of the giver.

And 'tis highly worthy of our respectful notice, in this day of reproach and contempt, cast upon this gift of the Spirit, even *learning*, that our blessed Lord, in speaking of ministerial accomplishments, which he had an infinite fullness of, should use such a striking phrase as this, *The tongue of the learned*; thereby doing peculiar honor to *special* and *superior learning*, as one of the *best gifts* that we are *to covet*; while, at the same time there *is a more excellent way*, even the sanctifying graces of the Spirit, which all, both ministers and people should be at the greatest pains to obtain, as they hope for salvation.

And now I freely submit it to the *learned* or judicious reader, whether Mr. *B.* or *I* have most betrayed the want of *learning* or *honesty*;—And if *modesty* be added, I should think it would 'lead *him* to enquire' again, whether he had not forgot the psalmist's example, Psa. 131. 1.—*Neither do I exercise myself in things too high for me.*

In p. 65 Mr. B, with an air of uncommon sagacity and reach of thought, collects a number of passages, from very distant parts of my book, which have no affinity to one another, (being upon different subjects) and sets them in opposition to a quotation which he had just made from Doctor *Owen*, to which *some* of them have no relation at all, and so may *both* be true; and *others*, tho' somewhat related, are no ways opposite, if taken in their true sense; and thereupon calls for attention, as if he had got some great advantage upon me, p. 65, bottom, 'Here reader observe,' says he,

1. 'That I have *proved* that he charges us falsely, as to our 'shutting out *learning*.'

Reply. He has, indeed, *accused* me of falshood herein; but entirely failed of *proof*. For as to what I said, p. 169, 'of the '*separates* having shut learning out of doors,' &c. I have proved, in foregoing pages, 29, 30, and on, that tis strictly and minutely true, of the people whom I charged it upon, even of my Stonington brethren, that separated. And I have also proved, p. 32, and on, that the same charge is *generally* true, with respect to the separates in *other parts of the land*; (as Mr. B. will have it that I mean, tho' I have shown to the contrary) tis evident from their practice,

practice, that they have not, hitherto, made any account of a college education, *as a needful qualificatisn* for the miniſtry. The ſeparates know this to be true; and the world knows it. So that I have not charged them *falſely*, in that reſpect, nor in any other, that I am conſcious of. It therefore concerns Mr. B. to withdraw his action, or find better proof.

But to *falſhood* he adds *hereſy*,

2. 'Here is an *awful* ſtroke againſt the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt,' ſays he, p. 65, bottom.

Awful indeed! if *one* who believes that the *manhood* of Jeſus Chriſt, was never a *perſon* diſtinct from the divine nature; but that the human nature of Jeſus Chriſt, from the firſt moment of its exiſtence, was united to the divine nature, conſtituting that wonderful perſon, *the Son of the living God*, or *Emmanuel, God with us*—That *one* who believes thus, ſhould rob the chriſtian religion of its peculiar glory, by ſtriking at the divinity of its glorious author the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, whom he honors as the Father, in that he is *the brightneſs of his glory and the expreſs image of his perſon*, and ſo is, 'by nature God,'—This, I ſay, is truly awful! For this would not only be inconſiſtent and abſurd but alſo profane and blaſphemous.

But how does Mr. B. ſupport his charge? Why, ſays he, 'what leſs can be the import of ſaying, that Chriſt taught and 'qualified men for the miniſtry, when he was perſonally preſent, 'as he *cannot*, or *does* not do now? What leſs can it be than to 'ſay, he is not *truly* God by *nature*, but only ſo by *office*; and 'that having ſet up officers in his kingdom, he is gone to heaven, 'and left *them* to order affairs in his abſence?'

Reply. My words are theſe, (p 15, ſermons) ''Tis true indeed Chriſt did not go to the colleges or ſchools of learning, for 'his firſt miniſters. Nor was there any need of ſuch a ſtep, 'while he himſelf, *the fountain of knowlege* (as in the errata) 'was perſonally preſent, to educate his ſons. But they whom 'he took into his ſchool, were, chiefly, unlearned and ignorant 'men. To whom—he gave ſuch a meaſure of knowlege, learning and grace, as abundantly qualified them,' &c.

And altho' this 'import that Chriſt' *then* 'taught and qualified men for the miniſtry,' *ſo* as we ſee 'he *does* not now do;' yet it by no means imports (as Mr. B injuriouſly turns it) that he *cannot* qualify men *now*, after the ſame manner that he did *then*. *Cannot*, here, is the fruit of his own invention—a word preſſed in by violence, to ſerve him in a deſperate attempt.—Suppoſing

I had ſaid, that when our Lord was *perſonally preſent* upon earth, he *caſt out devils* and *raiſed the dead*; would that have been as much as to ſay, he *cannot* do ſo now he is in heaven? The inference would have been juſt as good, as in the caſe above.—— But ſurely this is barbarous logic—dreadful reaſoning.——Who but Mr. B. could impoſe it upon his reader?

Compare the accuſed paſſage of *mine*, with thoſe expreſſions of Chriſt himſelf, John 16. 4. *Theſe things I ſaid not unto you at the beginning, becauſe I was with you.* And John 17. 11. *And now I am no more in the world, but theſe are in the world; and I come to thee. Holy Father keep thro' thine own name, thoſe whom thou haſt given me.* v. 12. *While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name.* v. 15. *I pray not that thou ſhouldſt take them out of the world, but that thou ſhouldſt keep them from the evil,* and I can't think but that every one muſt confeſs, there is an agreement of language.

Now, if his reaſoning is good upon *my* obſervation, concerning the *perſonal preſence of* Chriſt, in his human nature, then the ſame reaſoning holds good upon the *like* words of *Jeſus Chriſt*, touching the ſame thing, viz. his *bodily* preſence upon earth. And ſo we muſt underſtand his meaning in the words above, to be this, that while he was in the world, with his diſciples, he, indeed, kept them in his Father's name—kept them from falling and from ſinful evils: but now, being about to remove from earth to heaven, he *ſhould* not, or *could* not keep them any longer; and therefore committed them to his almighty Father, that *he* might keep them. And might he not then have gone on and ſaid, 'What leſs can be the import of' theſe expreſſions, 'or what leſs can it be than to ſay, he' (Chriſt) 'is not *truly* God by *nature*, but only ſo by office?'——'Tis evident to all that underſtand an argument, or the nature of reaſoning, that he might as well have argued thus *profanely* upon *Chriſt's own* words, as upon *mine*, which are quite agreeable to his, and of the ſame import: and ſo, upon diſcovering the *Arian hereſy* in that great Teacher from heaven, have cried out, with an air of confidence and zeal for the truth, 'Here is an awful ſtroke againſt the divinity of 'Jeſus Chriſt.'

'Tis a *ſore evil under the ſun*, that for want of *knowlege* and *underſtanding*, *modeſty* and *love*, there are men that will diſhonor God and abuſe their neighbours; yea profane the holy name of Jeſus, while they *would be thought* to do him honor!——How could Mr. *Backus* ſo entirely diveſt himſelf of generoſity and an

honeſt deſire to ſee the truth, as to ſearch my book throughout, to find the *denial* of *Chriſt's divinity*, overlooking numerous paſſages that ſhew the *contrary*? particularly p. 57, top, 'True 'faith in the *true Chriſt* ever views and apprehends him. as *God* 'manifeſt in the fleſh. John 1. 14. *The word was made fleſh*— 'And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the 'Father, full of grace and truth.'—Surely, if he had taken half the pains to prove me *ſound* in *principle*, that he has to prove me *corrupt*; nay, had he not ſhut his eyes, and, for want of a goſpel ſpirit, taken pains to make himſelf blind, he muſt (I think) have ſeen that I firmly believe the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, and that the contrary could not poſſibly be inferred from the paſſage excepted againſt.———On the whole———

If Mr. B. can find the denial of Chriſt's divinity in *my words* above, which he has ſo perverted and abuſed, tis not to be wondered at, that he ſhould charge 'a *great part* of the *miniſters* of 'our land,' with the ſame error, as he does p. 65, bottom.

Amidſt a great variety of remarks, and things that are ſo foreign and inconnected with one another, that tis hard to find what he is aiming at, and ſo, not eaſy to anſwer him, there is one in p. 66, 67 top, which I will briefly examine.——'Yet' (ſays he) 'Mr. F. declares that we don't know whether we have the 'pure, *divine truths* or not, ONLY as we have it from the *learned*.'

Reply. Mr. B. has not quoted the page in my book, where I ſpeak thus; neither can I, any where, find it in ſo many words. But ſomething like it I find p. 167, none 'of our common people 'could read one word of the bible, were it not for the precious 'gift of *learning*. Neither do they know whether the bible is 'rightly tranſlated, only as they have it from the learned.' And p. 169, 'The ſeparates having ſhut learning out of doors, have 'deprived themſelves of the beſt means of obtaining and preſerv-'ing the knowlege of *pure, divine truths*.'—Theſe things I have ſaid: and they are moſt evidently *true*, if taken in the ſenſe which they are ſpoken in, viz. of the *tranſlation* of the *Bible*, out of the original tongues, into our own language; which is done by *learning*, not by *inſpiration*.

But Mr. B. ſtrongly perverts my meaning, tho' plain, and *will* have it that I ſpeak of the true *ſpiritual* underſtanding of the *Engliſh texts*, or *doctrines* and *truths* of the bible, (when tranſlated) whereby men *are made wiſe to ſalvation*: as appears from the ſcriptures which he brings to oppoſe and confute my doctrine.

Particularly

Particularly 1 John 2. 18——27. *Little children, ye have an unction from the Holy One, and* YE KNOW ALL *things—and the same anointing teacheth you of all things.* That is, all true believers (for such have this unction) even *men, women* and *children,* are taught by this anointing of the holy Spirit, to read the bible in *Hebrew* and *Greek,* or to translate it into English, or to know if tis rightly done.——But Mr. B. will here object, that he don't mean *so.*——Reply. Then those scriptures are no ways applicable in the present case, nor do they prove any thing against me; for I spake only of *that* knowlege, which lies in such an acquaintance with the original languages, as enables a person to read them, and to judge whether they are rightly translated into the English tongue.

Then, after quoting a passage or two from my sermons, no more to his purpose, in the present dispute, than the texts above, or any thing else that he might have happened to have tho't of, he, with usual politeness, cries out, p. 67, middle, 'What *non-*'*sense* (if no worse) then is it, to tell of Christ's servants deri-'ving their knowlege of the truth and right to preach it, only 'from the hands of men?'——Surely if Mr. B. has now the exercise of common *goodsense,* he must, upon reflection, see, that the *nonsense* lies, not in what *I have said,* but in *his remarks* upon it.

But I know not when I shall finish, if I reply to *all* the errors and exceptionable things, that appear almost every where in his book. I must bear with the most that remain, and suppress the preparations made, for answer, (as I have done in many preceeding pages) rather than try my readers patience or my own much longer.

Chapter XI.

His reflections on my reference to the Lord of Conscience, upon what I say of the separates exercising their gifts in public, and upon truce-breaking, *considered and confuted.*

MR. B p. 78, observes, 'Mr. F. insinuates, that tis our lusts, which move us to deny their way of supporting 'ministers, and says, Let the Lord of Conscience judge,' &c.

The passage he refers to, is this, p. 164, sermons, 'Nor can I 'see which way to clear them of the lust of *covetousness* and *dis-*

'*obedience*

'*obedience* to lawful authority, in things merely civil and temporal. 'Let the Lord of conſcience judge, whether tis not *covetouſneſs* '(accompanied with *willfulneſs* and *diſobedience*, all founded on '*weakneſs*) rather than *pure conſcience*, that induceth the ſeparates 'to forfeit their honor, in breaking their *own* and their *fathers* 'civil covenants, to ſave their money.'

Upon which he cries out, as one aſtoniſhed, p. 79, 'Did mor-'tals ever hear ſuch a reference before?' For ſays he,

'1. If he left the affair with the Lord of conſcience, why 'does he publiſh ſuch reproachful ſuggeſtions to the world? 'For hereby we are ſtigmatized in this world, while the trial is 'referred to that which is to come.

'2. In the face of his reference, to the great Judge, he has 'judged himſelf, that we have forfeited our honor, to ſave our 'money. And if *that* is decided, what then is left to the other 'judge? unleſs it be what *ſpiritual judges* uſed to refer to the '*ſecular arm*, viz. the execution of *their* ſentence, and the inflict-'ing of puniſhment upon ſuch as they had condemned.

'3. Here is a falſhood in the face of his bill; for he charges '*us* with 'breaking *civil* covenants;' whereas we have no con-'tention with him about *civil* covenants; the point we are upon 'is the ſupport of *religious* worſhip,' &c.

Anſ. In theſe remarkable paſſages, and what follows to illuſ-trate and ſupport them, there are almoſt as many faults, errors and miſtakes, as there are ſentances.

I ſhall take notice of the following only,

1. He miſtakes the people of whom I am ſpeaking, as uſual through his book.

The paſſages preceeding and following this before us, evident-ly ſhew that I ſpeak of my own people that ſeparated, and not of the ſeparates in general, as he takes me.

2. He begs the queſtion, p. 79. 'Covenants (ſays he) which 'are *contrary to God's word*, ought not to be kept.'—He takes for granted what he had to prove, that the covenants I ſpeak of, are thus contrary, &c.

3. His account of 'making theſe covenants,' p. 79, don't at all agree with the covenant between me and people, which I ſpeak of as broken. For *that* was with entire unanimity, in the people, and without any exception taken, by the candidate, againſt the ſum propoſed.—Often renewed and altered (as there was occaſion, in thoſe fluctuating times) by the voice of old and young; ſo called 'their *own* and *fathers* covenants;' yet *broken* when they ſeparated.

4. He

4. He has made a very groſs miſtake in the *thing* that I refer-ed to the *Lord of conſcience*.

The paſſage under conſideration, contains a *fact* done, by my ſeparate brethren, and a *principle* from which they acted. The *fact* or *conduct* was, that of *breaking their covenant*, and therein *forfeiting* their honor. Now, *this* was open to the view of the world: and I had a right and power to judge of it, by the rules of reaſon and juſtice. Therefore I did not refer *this*—the tenor of my words ſhows that I *did not*. But what I refered and ſubmitted to the great Arbiter of human affairs, was, *the principle* which they acted from, viz. whether *covetouſneſs* or *pure conſcience*. This was out of ſight, to human diſcerning; and therefore properly refered to *Him who ſeeth the heart*.

Now, that Mr. B. entirely miſtook the *matter*, or *thing* refered, is manifeſt beyond diſpute, from his 2d remark, viz. 'In the face 'of his reference to the great Judge, he has judged himſelf, that 'we have forfeited our honor to ſave our money; and if *that* is 'decided, (ſays he) what is there left to the other judge?'——Which ſhows plainly, that Mr. B. ſuppoſes that I had judged of and decided *the very thing* which I had *refered* to the Lord of conſcience; which he here ſays expreſly, is 'that of forfeiting their 'honor,' &c. whereas it was not *that* that I referred, but the *principle* on which they acted, as I have ſhown above.—And ſo,

5. He has confounded thoſe things which ought to have been kept *diſtinct*, viz. the *conduct* and the *principle*; betraying himſelf and reader into an erroneous judgment.

6. He has greatly offended againſt the law of charity, which thinketh no evil, in thoſe words, 'what then is left to the other 'Judge, unleſs it be what *ſpiritual judges* uſed to refer to the *ſe-'cular arm*, viz. the execution of *their* ſentance, and inflicting 'puniſhment upon ſuch as they had condemned.'——Thereby ſuggeſting, that I had treated the *Moſt High*, as an inferior officer, ſubject to my decrees—*horrendum dictu!* too dreadful to be ſpoken, or thought of! evidently owing to his own confuſion of ideas, and want of diſcerning.——Once more,

7. ult. Without any ſhadow of reaſon, he charges me with *falſhood*, for calling the covenant between *me* and *people* (for *that's* the covenant I was ſpeaking of) by the name of a *civil covenant*. p. 79, 3d remark, 'Here's a falſhood (ſays he) in the face of 'his bill: for he charges us with breaking *civil covenants*; 'whereas we have no contention with him about *civil covenants*; 'the point we are upon is, the ſupport of *religious worſhip*.'

Reply.

Reply. So then, according to him, if any covenant is for the *ſupport of religious worſhip*, it cannot be a *civil covenant*.——The conſequence is falſe.

The building of a *meeting houſe*, keeping the doors, cleanſing the houſe, repairing the breaches, &c. are all for the ſupport of religious worſhip, as evidently as the maintenance of the miniſter that officiates in it. But the *contract* between the people and the workmen that build the houſe and keep it in repair, is entirely of a civil nature. For the *conſideration*, or *material cauſe* of the contract, without which it would not be binding, is a certain portion of worldly goods, or ſum of money, to be paid to the workmen: which belongs wholly to the civil magiſtrate, becauſe a thing of a civil nature.

If it be objected, that the workmen's ſervice, above, is *bodily exerciſe—worldly* buſineſs: but the miniſter's ſervice is *ſpiritual*, for the ſouls of men, ſo not to the purpoſe—

I anſwer, All the miniſter's ſpiritual ſervice, about divine and eternal things, is not only done *in the body*, but the *body* is very ſenſibly exerciſed in the whole of it. Whether he ſtudies, reads, writes, viſits, converſes, prays or preaches, tis all of it *bodily exerciſe*, and that of the moſt expenſive kind; while the *mind* is deeply engaged, thro' the whole of the important work, in communicating ſpiritual things. For which ſervice the people engage to render a portion, or certain quantity, of their *carnal things*, as Paul calls them, i. e. of their *worldly property*;—*theirs*, before the covenant made it the miniſter's due; now tis *his* property; but don't change its nature nor name, by ſhifting owners; tis worldly property ſtill, juſt as before. And for this reaſon, the covenant that obliges the people and ſecures it to the miniſter, is entirely a *civil covenant*, and can admit of no other denomination. —Let the ſervice done, be what it will, ſpiritual, civil or ſecular, tis ſolely the *conſideration* in the covenant, that denominates it. If the *conſideration* be money, or worldly ſubſtance, tis a civil covenant; in that the *material* cauſe of it, is worldly *property*, and is under the care of the *civil ſtate*.

His ſuggeſting that they 'are contrary to God's word, and 'ought not to be kept,' if it were not begging the queſtion, would be nothing to the preſent purpoſe: becauſe we are not here diſputing about the *lawfulneſs* of the covenants, or whether they are agreeable to *ſcripture* or not: but about the *nature* of theſe covenants; whether they come under the head of *civil contracts*.

For proof (if he offers any at all) that the covenants we are ſpeaking of, are not *civil*, Mr. B. obſerves, p. 79, 'The offerings

'of

'of the people, out of which they who miniſtred at the altar were 'fed, were as different from civil contracts as their own *houſes* 'were from the *temple*.'

Reply. Surely ſuch a confident aſſertion ſhould have been ſupported by ſome reaſon or ſcripture; and he ought to have ſhown us the difference: but nothing of this: he leaves the doctrine ſtanding upon its own baſis, unleſs ſupported by *his* authority.

The prieſts of the Lord, thoſe antient miniſters at the altar, were *partakers with the altar*. They had, by the law or *covenant* at Sinai, a right to a part of all the offerings and ſacrifices that were brought, by the people of Iſrael, according to the command of God by Moſes, Deut. 18. 1—5. which ſee.—Alſo *their* part of all other offerings, is as particularly mentioned in their proper places.

And beſides this portion, out of all the offerings of the people, which God commanded them to offer, the prieſts, the Lord's miniſters, had a certain ſtated maintenance, even the *tenth* part of all the *tithes*, which the tribe of *Levi* received, from the other tribes, for their ſervice in the tabernacle or temple. Numb. 18. v. 25—28. *And the Lord ſpake unto Moſes, ſaying, thus ſpeak unto the Levites and ſay unto them, when ye take of the children of Iſrael the tithes, which I have given you from them, for your inheritance; then ye ſhall offer up an* HEAVE OFFERING *of it for the Lord, even a* TENTH *part of the* TITHE.---*Thus you alſo ſhall offer an heave offering unto the Lord, of all your tithes which ye receive of the children of Iſrael, and ye ſhall give thereof the Lord's heave offering to Aaron the prieſt.*

So that the *tithe* of the *tithes*, i. e. the tenth part of all that Iſrael paid to the Levites, was offered up as an *heave offering* to the Lord; and this *heave offering* of the Lord's, was given to *Aaron* the prieſt and his ſons.

To theſe laws and ordinances Nehemiah refers, 10th chap. v. 38. *The prieſt, the ſon of Aaron, ſhall be with the Levites, when the Levites take tithes*, &c.

Thus God provided for his miniſters, by ſpecial laws or *covenants*, which he made between Iſrael and the Levites, and between the Levites and the prieſts his miniſters, by which they had a *certain ſum* or portion of worldly goods, for their ſpiritual ſervice—an ample maintenance, eſtabliſhed by *law* or *covenant*.

The people, in renewing covenant with God, ſolemnly engaged to keep all theſe laws and commandments of the Lord, and

ſo

ſo made them their own act and deed; that is, they *covenanted* with the Lord and with one another, that they would obſerve and do all theſe things, particularly mentioning the *offerings* and *tithes*; as we find, Neh. 9. laſt v. and 10th chap. throughout. And all this for the ſupport of *religious worſhip*.

From whence it appears, that, although theſe covenants reſpected *divine ſervice*, and obliged the religious officers to perform it, yet they were of a *politieal* or *civil* nature, lying within the province of the civil magiſtrate; in that they required *worldly ſubſtance* or *wages*, as a temporal reward for the ſervice which they enjoined. And accordingly the civil magiſtrate took care that the religious ſervices were performed, and that they who did the ſervice, had their dues; though *he* had no right to do the ſervice himſelf.

Moſes, who was king in Jeſurun, their political head, reproved the ſons of *Aaron*, the prieſt, and their *father* by *them*, for neglecting their duty, in the prieſt's office. Levit. 10. 17, 18. *Wherefore have ye not eaten the ſin-offering in the holy place*, &c.

Nehemiah, governor of Judea, perceiving that the portions of the *Levites* had not been given them, for want of which they had left the ſervice of the houſe of the Lord, and fled to the field, *contended with the rulers and ſaid, why is the houſe of God forſaken? And he gathered them together, and ſet them in their place*, Neh. 13. 11. 12.———Now, had not thoſe covenants, which required a *certain ſum* of worldly ſubſtance, viz. tithes and offerings for the Lord's miniſters, been of a civil or political nature, what right or authority would thoſe *civil rulers, Moſes and Nehemiah* (who well underſtood the duties of their ſtation) have had, to intermeddle with them—to reprove and correct the people for breaking or neglecting of them; and, on the whole, to *oblige* them to render to the *prieſts* and *Levites* their due?

On what ground then, does Mr. B. affirm, with ſuch aſſurance, 'that there is' ſuch a wide difference, between thoſe 'offerings 'and civil contracts?'

Now, to theſe very *offerings* of the people, due, by civil covenant, to the Lord's miniſters, for their religious ſervice at the altar, the apoſtle Paul immediately refers, ſaying, 1 Cor. 9. 13, 14. *Do ye not know that they which miniſter about holy things, live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?* EVEN SO *hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the goſpel ſhould live of the goſpel.*

Which

Which ſhows at leaſt *this*, among many other things, that as God's miniſters at the altar, had a certain portion of worldly goods ſecured to them by civil covenant, for their ſpiritual ſervice, on which they lived, while doing of it; EVEN SO has the Lord ordained, that they which preach the goſpel ſhould *live of the goſpel*, or have a portion of worldly goods, at leaſt their *temporal living*, ſecured to them by a covenant, which the *civil* magiſtrate may ſee performed. And Paul's adding, *But I have uſed none of theſe things*, neceſſarily ſuppoſes, that he had *right* to do it.

Mr. B. p. 80, faults me for ſaying of the ſeparates, p. 163. 'that, 'according to one grand principle of their churches, every one 'muſt exerciſe his gifts in public, as he is impreſſed or moved 'by the Spirit.——In reference to which he ſays, 'I have before 'ſhown that we hold, with the apoſtles, that each one ought to 'improve the gifts which God has given him.'

This is undoubtedly true, whether 'he has *ſhown* it' or not. *All* gifts are to be improved, agreeable to the nature and intention of them, 1 Pet. 4. 10. *As every man hath received the gift, even ſo miniſter the ſame one to another, as good ſtewards of the manifold grace of God.* Whether it be the gift of healing, or of charity and hoſpitality (as ver. preceeding) and of worldly goods enabling thereto; or of reaſon and argumentation, memory, &c. any kind of gift is to be uſed for mutual benefit.—'*One to another*,' ſays the text—you to me and I to you.——But there is nothing more of *public teaching*, as *goſpel miniſters*, here intended, than any other gift; tho' Mr. B. wrongly applies the text, in that ſenſe alone, p. 62.

But taking this text to include *public teaching*, as well as other things, it gives no liberty for all *gifted* brethren thus to teach, merely becauſe they are *gifted*. 'Spiritual gifts are to be exer-'ciſed by every one *in his own ſphere*, by private perſons *pri-'vately*; by thoſe that are in office *publicly*, and in the congrega-'tion. It is very obſervable, that *Aquilla* and *Priſcilla*, private 'perſons, yet of eminent gifts, (inſomuch as they knew the way 'of Chriſt more perfectly than *Apollos* himſelf, who was an elo-'quent man and mighty in the ſcriptures) kept their own place: 'and whereas *Apollos*, being a miniſter in office, (as appears 1 'Cor. 3. 5) preached publicly in the ſynagogues, they, as gifted 'chriſtians, did not undertake to preach *publicly*, took him to 'them, and privately expounded to him the way of God more 'perfectly, Acts 18.—This is a notable pattern for private chriſ-'tians, even of the higheſt form, to walk by: in this way they 'may find employment for all their gifts,' &c.

If tis pleaded, that any gifted brother may exercise his gifts, by public, teaching, because tis added, v. 11. *If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God*; tis answered; 'Those words permit not every gifted man to be a *preacher*; but direct every *preacher* in the right dispensation of that weighty office.——'*Calvin*, excellently upon these words, *He that speaketh*, observes, '*Qui publica authoritate rite ordinatus est*, He that by public authority is rightly ordained to speak, *let him speak as the oracles of God*. And *Estius*, *Qui ad hujus modi munus in ecclesia vocatur*, 'He that is called in the church to this work, *let him speak as the oracles of God*.'*——In the sense above, and according to due order, it is freely granted, 'that each one ought to improve the 'gifts which God has given him.'

But what of all this? Herein he advances nothing that militates against what I have said. If he meant to oppose or confute me, in this place, he should have shown, that my saying, the separates hold it right for 'every one to exercise his gifts in *public*, as he is *impressed* or *moved* by the Spirit.' *is not so*, but a false account of the matter: then he would have spoken to the purpose. But this he don't attempt. Instead of looking me thus in the face, and manfully opposing of me, by pertinent arguments, he starts from the question, and charges me with what is neither said, nor implied in my observation.—For tis evident that, in the faulted passage above, I have limited the charge of 'speaking *in public*,' to them that *have gifts*, and that are *impressed* or *moved* by the Spirit, to exercise them. And from hence Mr. B. infers, that I therein charge the separates with 'holding that ALL 'have the gift for public teachers,' whether they have *any* gifts or not, and whether they are *impressed* or *moved* by the Spirit or no; which widely differs from what I said.

Supposing I had asserted, that the separates allow their *gifted* brethren to preach *publicly*, when they are IMPRESSED OR MOVED thereto by the Spirit; would it be *fair* or *true* for Mr. B. to infer from thence (and charge accordingly) that 'I pretend that they hold that ALL the fraternity, *men*, *women* and *children*, are fit for *public teachers*, whether they have *any* gifts, or are *impressed* and *moved* by the Spirit, or not?' No surely. But it would be just as good an inference, and just as fair and true a representation, as that which he has made of my words.

The truth is, I have said *one* thing; Mr. B. in his answer, assumes *another*, entirely different: and therefore the consequence may

* Provincial Assembly of London, p. 102, 103.

may be *one* thing, as well as *another*, i. e. there is no conſequence at all.—This is another inſtance of confuſed talk, or falſe and ſophiſtical reaſoning.

But upon his charging me with what I had *not* ſaid, he forms a judgment containing a character, which I had rather he ſhould *give*, than I *deſerve*. This, ſays he, 'is only to give *another* proof 'of his being a *falſe accuſer*, if not a *fierce deſpiſer of thoſe that are* 'good.'

Anſwer. I have made it evident that Mr. B. has entirely miſſed the mark, thro' his whole book, with reſpect to *the ſeparates* of whom I am ſpeaking. All the foregoing expreſſions, in my diſcourſes, which he has accuſed of *falſhood*, I have made appear to be *ſtrictly true* of the people whoſe ſeparations I was deſcribing, and true, *in general*, with reſpect to the whole denomination. And *this* before us, as it ſtands in my book, is exactly true of them ALL, for ought that he has offered to confute it.

So that this is ſo far from being *another* proof, or inſtance, of my being a *falſe accuſer*, (as if he had proved me guilty of *many falſhoods* already) that neither *this*, nor any other expreſſion of my book, as yet, hath been *proved* to infringe upon *truth*.

As to what I ſay of *truce-breaking*, p. 173—The ſubſtance of what Mr. B. has urged againſt me, p. 82—88, is founded upon two great and evident miſtakes, viz. about the *people* whom I charge with *truce-breaking*, and the *character* of thoſe churches, with whom they broke covenant, by their ſeparating.

1. As to the *people*, or ſeparates, whom I charge with *truce-breaking*, they are evidently thoſe that left the churches in this town, and *mine* eſpecially; as appears from the whole of the preceeding page, viz. 172, and from the leading expreſſion to this paſſage, under conſideration; agreeable to what I have ſufficiently ſhown, in the beginning of this work.——Of *theſe* I have ſaid, that they are *truce-breakers*; and I ſee no reaſon to retract. For if the going directly contrary to the very terms and tenor of the covenant, as *theſe* brethren have done, while the church remained in the ſame ſtate and order as when they joined us, and *that* agreeable to the order of the goſpel, be not a breach of covenant, there cannot, I think, be any ſuch error committed by men.

Now, altho' I ſuppoſe it to be true, that the ſeparates, in general, have broken covenant with the churches, from whence they departed; yet I do not *affirm* it. My obſervation is reſtricted, or immediately refers to *them* that left my congregation, or

others

others in town; of whom I say, 'the *body* of them are *truce-breakers*:' I say, *the body*, because there were numbers that joined the separates, who were not in communion with us: so are not included in the charge.——Mr. B. applies the passage to all the separates in the country, which are out of the question: and so his arguments to prove it a wrong charge, are not to the purpose.——But

2. The character which he gives of those churches from whom he says tis right and a duty to separate, is no ways applicable to the churches, with whom my brethren broke covenant, in separating from them. And so, again, all his arguments and quotations from learned authors, are ineffectual to support his cause.

His general character of 'those *persons* and churches,' from whom it is 'an incumbent duty to withdraw,' is this, 'such 'as are evidently *corrupt* and will not be *reclaimed*.' p. 82, middle. His more particular branches of character of those churches, from which to separate, he says, is no breach of covenant, are such as will not suffer any 'to go over *men's* lines, to get food for their 'hungry souls,' implied p. 83, top—'In what church a man is 'baptized in infancy, there all choice is prevented'—there 'he is 'to abide, on the penalties of being esteemed and dealt with as a '*schismatic*.'—'In what *parish* his habitation falls to be, in that 'particular *parish church* is he bound to communicate, in all ordi-'nances of worship.' Dr. *Owen*, p. 83.——Churches to whom 'the general assembly are the law-givers,' (i. e. not as *civil communities*, but *as churches*, or tis nothing to the purpose) 'and the '*parish* are the executors thereof,' p. 84.—Churches in which are 'sinful practices and disorderly walkings and *unwarranted* 'ways of worship,' implied p. 85. (i. e. allowed of, or habitually and obstinately persisted in, against the advice and endeavors of such as see and abhor them; otherwise the church of *Corinth* should have been separated from, as well as many other true churches:) 'churches in which there is a mixture of *wicked* 'men, and the old opinion of the unlawfulness of separation 'from' such, 'is made a scarecrow to frighten men from *attempting* the *reformation* of the *greatest* evils.' Dr. Owen, p. 85.—'In which men are not 'allowed to judge of what is best for 'their own edification, and to act according unto the judgment 'which they make.' Dr. Owen, p. 86.—Where 'true evangelical mutual *love* is lost'—'purity of communion lost; and those 'received' (as) '*principal members* of churches, who, by all the 'rules of primitive discipline, ought to be cast out of them.'—

'Where

'Where all this hath enſued on the neglect of evangelical *diſci-*
'*pline* in' (the) 'churches, or turning of it into *worldly dominion*.'
'Mutual *watch* over one another. that ought to be in all the
'members of the church—loſt.' Dr. Owen, p. 87.

'The churches which Mr F. pleads for' (ſays he, p. 88) 'are *greatly*
'corrupted and depraved in *thoſe very points* which Dr. *Owen*
'ſpeaks of.'——He ſhould have uſed the Doctor's very words,
and inſtead of *greatly*, ſaid, '*ſo* corrupted and depraved,'
in order to have applied the Doctor in the preſent caſe, or to
make him ſay any thing to his purpoſe, in that concluding ſen-
tance, p 88, top, viz. ''Tis a damnable ſin' (knowingly) 'to
'join with them,' (ſuch churches) 'or not to ſeparate from
'them.'

This is the character of the churches from which tis no *breach*
of covenant, but a duty, to ſeparate, according to Mr. B. which
character he applies to *our churches*.

We will now view the character of the *miniſters* that are ſet in
theſe churches, to feed them, and then ſee if the whole is appli-
cable, in the preſent caſe.——This, alſo, Mr. B. gives us p. 84,
85, margin, by Dr. Frank.———He tells us, they are 'carnal
'preachers,' under the influence of 'pride and ambition.'—
'They interpret whatever is done to their *perſons*, as an aſſault
'againſt their holy function—pouring forth their *malice* and *bit-*
'*terneſs* upon all thoſe, who, they ſuppoſe have affronted them.
'If a child of God, and eſpecially one of an inferior rank, deals
'plainly with them, they *ſwell* with *anger*, and tell him, they are
'not accountable to him. He ſhould not reflect upon the ſacred
'order. The *churliſh* temper of a *great many miniſters*' is ſuch
'that 'people' knowing them to be ſo, 'are afraid to ſpeak to
'them at all.' Intimating alſo, by a queſtion of the Doctor's,
'that they entertain their hearers with fine, critical remarks,
'hiſtories, ſymbols, flouriſhes of wit, flowers of oratory, and ſuch
'like human inventions.'—'Perverting God's ordinances by re-
'jecting and calumniating thoſe that deſire, heartily, to govern
'their lives by the goſpel of Chriſt.'—'He that hears ſuch a
'*railer*, doth not hear *Chriſt*, but the *Devil* himſelf.' p. 85,
bottom.

Theſe are the *corrupt, depraved churches*; and *theſe* the *carnal*
wicked miniſters, which Mr. B. has ſet before us, as what may be
ſeparated from, without the ſin of *truce breaking*. And I rea-
dily grant it, if after all due pains, and proper means are uſed,
they remain irreclaimable.

But

But are *these* the *churches* and *ministers* from which 'the body 'of the separates' that *I* was speaking of, withdrew? and for which I call them *truce breakers*?——Mr. B. evidently *supposes* them to be *so much* like those which he describes, by Dr. *Owen* and Dr. *Frank*, as to justify a separation from them.—And, to make those eminent authors speak any thing to *the purpose*, for which he quotes them, he must be supposed to mean and intend to represent *our churches* and *ministers* to be *full as bad—as corrupt, depraved* and *wicked*, as those that are described by the authors above; or else the *conclusion* or *sentance* of those great and good men, against the objects which they respectively had in view, (viz. the *churches* and *ministers* they speak of) will by no means justify him in forming the *like* conclusion against *our* churches and ministers as they did, viz. that they ought to be separated from, and that tis no breach of covenant thus to withdraw. For, not only the *quality*, but the *degree* of offence, must be considered and brought into the charge, to justify the same conduct.

And is this the case? Are those ministers and churches which our brethren left, *so* bad, *so* corrupt and depraved, as those above described? or any thing like them? that he should bring those eminent writers, to justify his dreadful treatment of us? Surely no—Our real character is as different from that which he has set up, as the true protestant churches are from the antichristian; or as the apostle *Peter* was from the *Pope* of Rome; or the gentle *Barnabas* and *Paul*, from Mr. *Backus*. And I know not of a more striking contrast.——Tho', tis evident, he thinks he has found the character of our churches and their ministers, in the writings of those celebrated authors, yet the quotations he makes from their writings, are as far from proving his point, as if he had brought a chapter out of the *Alcoran*.—'Tis really strange, that Mr. B. who was bred among us, and had the advantage of knowing better things of our churches and their ministers, 'could 'forbear blushing over his pen, employed in transcribing those 'passages, which evidently carry in them a confutation of what 'they are brought to maintain.' Or if he did not know our *true character*, then he must be equally faulty, in applying so *bad* a one, to an object he was ignorant of.

My knowlege of the churches in this neighbourhood, and particularly in *Stonington*, from which 'the body of the separates' described in my sermons, withdrew; and who are *the very separates* that I charge with *covenant-breaking*, enables me to wipe

off

off the reproaches that Mr. B. has caſt upon them, to ſave our ſeparate brethren from the ſin of breaking their covenant. Neither can I be ſo unjuſt to my brethren, the *miniſters* in general, or to thoſe of the other churches in this town, or even to myſelf, (amidſt all my infirmities) as to own the character he gives of the miniſters deſcribed by Dr. *Frank*, or think it applicable to *us*. We deteſt thoſe who deſerve ſuch a character.

As to going over '*men's lines*,' as Mr. B. terms it, for ſpiritual entertainment—tho' tis generally thought expedient, and I believe *juſtly*, that men ſhould *ordinarily* keep within the limits of the church and congregation, where they dwell—meet, and worſhip with their brethren, and encourage one anothers hearts, in building up the kingdom *there*; yet ſo gentle and condeſcending has our ſpirit and practice ever been, ſince I dwelt in this place, that both *before*, *at*, and *after* the general awakening, thro' the land, there have been frequent inſtances of perſons attending public worſhip, and joining in full communion, with other churches in town, yea and in neighbouring towns too, in a *ſtated way*, upon the plea of greater conveniency, or better edification. Which privilege being aſked, without any uncharitable reflections upon the churches or miniſters from whence they went, has been granted with freedom: and no breach of goſpel peace occaſioned thereby; but chriſtian harmony maintained: and ſo the denial of this liberty, was never an occaſion of ſeparation in *this* place. And I have known many like inſtances, in the ſtanding churches, elſewhere in the land.—Yea tis a common thing.

Indeed, when *numbers*, in *full communion* with *one* church, have gone over to *another*, without paying due regard to their brethren, and with tokens of uncharitableneſs towards their paſtor and church, they have, with good reaſon, been called to account.

So far are our churches from a rigid confinement of their brethren and neighbours, at all events, to *pariſh lines*, which are neceſſary (upon other accounts) to the well-being of ſociety.

The teſtimony of the heads of one of our colleges, which he brings p. 83, 84 top, to prove his charge againſt us, reſpecting *lines*, &c. is really not to his purpoſe; for *that* relates only to the *placing* of meeting-houſes for public worſhip, which all the towns in the colony have, by their repreſentatives, freely ſubmitted to the determination of the general aſſembly: and that for wiſe ends; becauſe *this*, very ſenſibly, affects the people's *temporal intereſt*, both as to the *buildings* themſelves, and the *travel* to im-

prove

prove them; and *ſo* is a matter of a *civil* nature. But *this* don't ſo much as touch the *principles*, the *order*, *diſcipline* and *government* of the *churches*, that worſhip in thoſe houſes. They may croſs *lines*, &c. with reſpect to their communicants and worſhippers, and other things relating to *church order*, according as the churches agree among themſelves.

And therefore what he adds, p. 84, top, 'that the general 'aſſembly are the *law-givers* to the church,' (becauſe they fix the place for the meeting houſe, which is *ordinarily* agreed upon, by the people) is a *doctrine* ſo evidently void of truth and conſiſtency, that it dies under his pen.

'Unwarranted ways of worſhip,' I never heard objected againſt our churches, even by our ſeparating brethren, (as I remember) nor is there any ſhadow of reaſon for the charge.

'Sinful practices, diſorderly walkings, mixture of wicked men,' &c. in our churches, as to *individuals*, have undoubtedly happened; as in Corinth, and as is common to all the churches of Chriſt.——But what of *this* hath appeared, has been our grief, and ſpecial concern to put away: and when objected againſt us, or complained of to us, by our *brethren* that left us, (I ſpeak what I know) they have been intreated, with expreſſions of tenderneſs and deep concern, to ſtand up with us *againſt the evil doers*, for their conviction and amendment, or rejection: but they have refuſed.

'Evangelical diſcipline,' without any touch of 'worldly do-'minion'—'mutual love and mutual watch over one another,' as incumbent on '*all* the members or the church,' were ſo manifeſt among us, in the day of ſeparations from us, that a brother, *then* of the ſtanding order, in a neighbour church, though tender of the *ſeparates*, *now* an inflexible *one* himſelf, happening at one of our *church meetings* for diſcipline, was ſo well ſatisfied and pleaſed with the *church's* conduct, on account of the gentleneſs, tenderneſs and fidelity of paſtor and brethren, 'that (ſays 'he) if I had a caſe depending in which *my very life* was con-'cerned, I could freely ſubmit it to the examination and judg-'ment of *this*, or ſuch a church;' or words to that effect.—— *This* is one of the *churches* and *miniſters* from which the 'body of 'the ſeparates' withdrew, in violation of ſolemn covenant.

And ſo of every other article of charge, that Mr. B. by the hands of Dr. *Owen* and Dr. *Frank*, exhibits againſt our churches and miniſters, from which *the ſeparates*, that *I* deſcribed, departed, I could eaſily ſhew how groundleſs they are. But I hope

enough

enough has been ſaid, to ſatisty the candid, peaceable and ſober-minded part of mankind: and as to the *contentious*, who will not believe nor obey the truth, I leave them to the righteous Judge.

Now, if the characters, that Mr. B. has drawn from the two venerable Doctors above, and applied to our churches as a ſufficient reaſon to juſtify the ſeparations from them, and ſo to clear the ſeparates of covenant breaking, do not belong to the miniſter, and churches, from which the '*body* of the ſeparates,' ſpoken of in my book, withdrew themſelves, (as I think I have made it evident they *do not*) then the charge of *truce breaking*, remains, in its full weight, upon thoſe that ſeparated from *our churches*, notwithſtanding all that he has urged to clear them. For OURS are not *the churches* he deſcribes; not being *ſo corrupt* and *depraved*, as to anſwer *his* characters, which are ſuppoſed neceſſary to juſtify a ſeparation.

Wherefore, with all freedom, I take Mr. *Backus's* own conceſſion to decide the whole controverſy, upon this head of *covenant breaking*; and by his *own* words prove, that the *body* of the ſeparates, deſcribed in my ſermons, are guilty as they are charged.

For he ſays (p. 85. middle) 'I heartily concur with him,' (Dr. Owen) 'that *cauſeleſs* ſeparations from *eſtabliſhed* churches, walking according to the order of the goſpel, (tho' perhaps failing in 'the practice of ſome things of ſmall concernment) IS NO SMALL 'SIN.'——But ſuch are the *churches* from which the ſeparations, *that I deſcribe*, were made; and nothing appears to the contrary, from all that he has ſaid:—Such are the churches, in general, in this part of the land, and particularly where the greateſt ſeparations have taken place, as I hope hath been, in ſome meaſure, cleared, both in the ſermons and in the preſent diſcourſe.

Tho' miniſters are men of like paſſions with others, and labour under numerous infirmities; and tho' many ſinful imperfections are found in all our churches, which call for reformation, yet there's nothing appears, from all that has been ſaid and proved againſt them, but that in a general way, they are 'walking 'according to the order of the goſpel,' even thoſe particularly, that numbers have ſeparated from.—And therefore Mr. B. himſelf has judged, 'that they are guilty of no ſmall ſin,' nothing leſs than the ſin of *truce breaking*.

The judicious reader will now ſay, whether *Doctor Owen* has given ſuch 'a clear and full anſwer to my charge' of *covenant-*

breaking,

breaking, as Mr. B. p. 87, has boasted. For by comparing what the Doctor has said of the churches which *he* had in view, with the account which has been given of the churches in the question, 'twill be easy to see, that the characters which the *Doctor* draws, are no ways applicable in the present case. And therefore my charge remains untouch'd by those quotations.

Chapter XII.

Account of Mr. Smith's *ordination and excommunication, examined and corrected—Exclamation upon the fall of New-England—His account of John Smith's poisoning his wife.*

I AM glad of this opportunity of giving a clearer account of Mr. *Smith's* ordination and censure, than either Mr. B. or I *have* done before.

In p. 145 of my book, in the margin, tis said of their first minister, (Mr. *Smith*) 'Him they chose—ordained—silenced—cast 'out of their church, and delivered up to satan, in *less* than a 'year:' Which account I find, upon further enquiry, is not so correct as I verily thought it was, when I entered that marginal note.

By the records, or minutes of their church, it appears, that Mr. *Smith* was chosen November 27, 1746, and ordained 14 days after, viz. December 10th, 1746, and that he was excommunicated, by a council, August 3, 1749, which was 2 years and 8 months nearly, after his ordination. Mr. B. (p. 92) agrees in the time of his ordination; but differs from the records near a year, as to the time of his excommunication; which he says was July 20, 1750: *this* must be a mistake in Mr. B if their church records are true.—— He also tells us (same p.) that Mr. *Smith*, after his ordination, 'ministred in word and ordinances to them, 'till the spring 1749, then he went off and left his flock,' &c. Which, by the following account, is as great a mistake as the former.—— By a narrative of that whole affair, taken from Mr. *Smith's* own mouth, as near as it could be related, by a gentleman of integrity, (whose letter is in hand, and the substance of it as follows) I find Mr. *Smith* gives this account, viz. '*Soon after* I 'was ordained at *Stonington*, I preached to the people from Eph. '2. 22.'—'in a clear line of gospel truth'—all on a sudden I 'perceived that the church did not give me fellowship.'—This occasioned

occaſioned ſome talk that day—' we parted in great confuſion. Monday diſcourſed the brethren largely on the ſubject.—' We ' muſt ſee eye to eye, (ſays Mr. S) or my lips will be forever ſeal-' ed.'—' The labouring point could not be gained.'—' I took a ' tour into the country.'—Returned before the ſacrament day—' The church deſired me to proceed as uſual,'—' I objected and ' refuſed.'—' Then the church called a council, and charged me ' with neglect of duty:' and yet ſaid in council, ' we have no-' thing againſt brother *Smith*, and ſo every man went to his tent.'

' I tried if poſſible to get over the difficulty'—' Was willing ' to have another labour with them'—' But all was in vain, for ' after a few ſabbaths my mouth was quite ſtopped' (ſo) ' that ' I could not ſpeak for want of fellowſhip.'——' All this hap-' pened in about the ſpace of *one year* after my ordination.'—— Which muſt be about December 1747, when his mouth was ſtopped; and we hear no more of his ' miniſtring in word and ' ordinances to his people,' as Mr. B. relates: for ſays Mr. *Smith*, ' *Soon after this*' (viz. the ſtopping of his mouth) 'I left the peo-' ple and the place, and moved my family to *Mansfield*, where I ' lived for about *one year*, before I heard any thing from Sto-' nington.'——This agrees very nearly with my account, as to the *time* of his *continuing* in the miniſtry at Stonington. I ſay ' *leſs* than a year;' Mr. *Smith* ſays ' *about* one year;' which may be a little *leſs* or a little *more*.—My account ſuppoſes that the *church* ſilenced him—by *his* account it ſeems he rather ſilenced himſelf, or had his mouth ſtopped, without any church act; and, of his own accord, went off, ſoon after he left miniſtring to his people; which places his removal about the ſpring of the year 1748.—And about a year after this, (in 1749) as Mr. *Smith's* account goes on, ' the church at Stonington called a *council*'—' ſent to ' me to anſwer their charge.'—' I attended it, and they had a ' full hearing of the matters alledged againſt me.'—After much time ſpent and many things ſaid, ' the moderator'—turning to ' me ſays,'—' there is ſome accurſed thing with you that you, by ' your ſoftneſs, hide from us; and for which I now, in the name ' of the Lord Jeſus, declare you unworthy to have a ſtanding in ' his houſe, and hereby cut you off from all privileges in the ' ſame, and deliver you over to the buffetings of the devil.'—— ' Another of the council ſays, I as a friend to the Bridegroom, ' and in the name of the Bride, the Lamb's wife, declare you unfit ' to walk the ſtreets of the new Jeruſalem, and hereby do caſt ' you out of the ſame, and ſet you down in the cold ſhades of

' *Antichriſt*

'*Antichriſt* and the dark lanes of *Babylon*, to be buffetted by the 'Devil, and eat no more of the childrens bread.'—Another ſays, 'as you are now excommunicated by the *Holy Ghoſt*, you will 'ſoon *feel* and *curſe* like a devil.' 'And ſo the matter ended.'

This is Mr *Smith's* account of that affair, as my informer relates it.—So that he was indeed delivered up to *Satan*; I ſuppoſed by the *church*, but, as he ſays, 'twas done by *one* and *another* of the *council*, and above a year after the time ſet in my marginal note.—— From all which it appears, that there are ſeveral miſtakes, both in Mr. *Backus's* account and in mine: neither is it eaſy, if practicable, to find out, *exactly*, the truth of that affair, in all the circumſtances of it.—But I think it is evident, from accounts above, that difficulties ſoon ariſing between Mr. *Smith* and his people, his mouth was ſtopped, or ſilenced, by that means; and ſo he ceaſed from his miniſtry at *Stonington*, in about a year after he was ordained: which muſt be the latter end of the year 1747.—That ſoon after this he left his people and the place; which brings to the ſpring of the year 1748—That after about a year's abſence, he returned and received his excommunication, by the council, viz. *Aug* 3, 1749, as their records place that event.

So that Mr. *Backus*, in ſaying, p. 92, 'he miniſtred to his peo-'ple—till ſpring 1749.' has miſtook above a year: and has miſſed it near as much, in placing his excommunication, July 1750, which was Aug 1749.——*I* was, by the above account, miſtaken more than a year, as to the time of his being delivered up to ſatan; though (according to Mr. Smith) I was near right, if not exactly ſo, as to the time of his being ſilenced, or ceaſing to miniſter.

I am very ſorry that I made any miſtakes; and blame myſelf for not enquiring more ſtrictly into that matter, before I wrote. I have only to ſay, in vindication, that, relying upon the information of neighbours, and the underſtanding I had long had of that affair, there was no doubt, in my mind, of its being exactly as I related it.——At moſt, it is but a circumſtantial error, which I could have no temptation, knowingly, to commit; as the argument I was upon, viz that of his being 'elected by revelation,' p 145, was no ways affected by it: *this* might have been true or falſe, had the time of his miniſtration been *one*, *three*, or *five* years.

And *this*, viz their *acting upon revelation*, in that affair, was the main point that Mr. B. had to confute, if it were not ſo.

But

But to this he ſays not a word; which is a tacit acknowlegement, that the fact alledged was true.—As to any other circumſtances in that affair, wherein I differ from Mr. B. I don't obſerve any but what are too immaterial to demand attention, at this time.*

His exclamation, p. 92, 'But O *New-England, New England*, 'whither art thou fallen!' &c. ſeems expreſſive of a deep concern for the churches and the purity of religion by means of a godly miniſtry, and a holy communion: intimating, at the ſame time, that there is now a very great apoſtacy.

I heartily join in lamenting all corruption, and in earneſt deſires of a reformation, in all inſtances and degrees of declenſion. But ought we not to be very thankful, to the great Head of the churches, that he has ſupplied them with *ſo many* able and faithful miniſters, as there are, at this day, and have been all along in days paſt? That there are *ſo many* godly ones in communion, as there are: and that *ſo much* care is taken, as it appears there is, to preſerve the miniſtry and the churches pure?—And ought not the ſeparates to reflect ſeriouſly upon themſelves, and conſider, whether they have not been greatly to blame, in that they have, generally, and in the largeſt numbers (if I miſtake not) riſen up againſt and ſeparated from *thoſe very miniſters*, which they themſelves judged to be *ſpiritual men*, and *true preachers* of the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt; and which many of them eſteem to be ſo, to this day? Miniſters that make conſcience of introducing none but men of God to the ſacred office; even ſuch as in a judgment of charity, are competently furniſhed with miniſterial gifts and graces: to the diſcovery of which they are ſtrictly examined, as to the whole of the miniſterial furniture? And alſo, that their ſeparation has been from thoſe very churches, in which they themſelves have been duly examined about their renovation of heart, and holineſs of life, as abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation; agreeable to the firſt churches, mentioned p. 92: which has been the ſtated practice of this church (under my care) from which the greater part have ſeparated: and this have we done for *their* ſafety and for our own peace and comfort: though at the ſame time, we dare not make regenerating grace a poſitive *term* of admiſſion to outward, ſpecial privileges, becauſe we cannot know the heart.

But

* I will here correct another miſtake in my ſermons, P. 177, line 4 bottom, for thoſe words, 'in a *diſtant government in this* 'land,' read, '*in a diſtant land*.'

But he goes on, p. 92, 'Once it could be ſaid of thee,' (New-England) 'that no man became a miniſter or a communicant 'in thy churches, until he had been ſeverely examined about his 'regeneration as well as converſation: and if a miniſter did miſbe-'have, he ſoon heard of it, and became either a penitent, or a 'depoſed man.' (Dr. Cotton Mather.) 'Yet now thoſe who 'are making ſome imperfect attempts to *reſtore* that *antient diſ-'cipline*, are thus publicly ſtigmatized, by one of thy miniſters,' O *New-England*!

Reply. By 'reſtoring that antient diſcipline,' (juſt before mentioned by Dr. Mather) he plainly inſinuates, that the miniſters and communicants in our ſtanding churches, are not 'exa-'mined about their *regeneration* and *converſation*:' which I have juſt ſhown to be a wrong charge upon thoſe miniſters and churches, where the ſeparations that I deſcribed took place.—And he alſo inſinuates, that if the miniſters of our churches do *miſbehave*, i. e are guilty of ſcandal, they are not convicted and brought to repentance, or *depoſed*; which, tis well known from the *practice* of our miniſters and churches, in proceeding againſt offenders, is a groundleſs reflection, and extremely injurious. We have had ſorrowful inſtances of offending miniſters, who have been faithfully dealt with according to the goſpel; enough to convince the world, that there was no ground for Mr B. thus to reflect.

So that if the ſeparates are attempting to 'reſtore that antient 'diſcipline,' &c. they are only *attempting* to do *that* which the miniſters and churches, from whence thoſe very people fled, (if he keeps to his ſubject) have been long in the practice of—which they are doing daily, and which they deſire to do more perfectly.

But '*one* of thy miniſters has publicly ſtigmatized thoſe that 'attempt to reſtore antient diſcipline,' (ſays Mr. B. p. 93) i. e. the *ſeparates*.

Reply. This *miniſter* I take to be *myſelf*; and ſay, I have not ſet any *brand of infamy* upon them (as the word *ſtigmatize*, ſignifies) but what they fixed on themſelves. For I have only rehearſed their deeds.—I have not *defamed* or *ſlandered* them; (as the word alſo imports) for I have only publiſhed their *principles*, *ſpirit*, *practices*, &c. which *they* themſelves profeſſed and acted over in the open view of the world; and which many held faſt. And if this is *ſlander* or *defamation*, the apoſtle Paul moſt certainly ſlandered the *Cretians*, when he publiſhed their odious character

to the world, upon the credit of one of their prophets, Tit. 1. 12, 13. *One of themſelves, even a prophet of their own ſaid, the Cretians were always liars, ſlow bellies, evil beaſts. This witneſs is true.* Yea, and Mr. *Backus* too, will be found to be one of the greateſt *ſlanderers* or ſtigmatizers of the age, from the horrible things he has publiſhed againſt the ſtanding miniſters and churches. If he does not believe in his conſcience, that thoſe things are *truly* charged, he deſerves as bad a name as the *Cretians*. And if they are *true*, he has not *ſlandered* us; but if they are *falſe*, he *has*. And upon this hypotheſis I am ready to join iſſue.

I would by no means reflect upon any of my diſſenting, chriſtian brethren. I have ſufficiently expreſſed my charity for the *baptiſts*, as having a number of worthy, good miniſters and brethren in their churches. But has not Mr. B. a little forgot the *ſect* he profeſſes to be of; and the ſentiments of the fathers in the *New-England* churches, with reſpect to thoſe that are of his principles and ways? How comes it that *he*, with an air of gravity and deep concern, ſhould ſhake his head and cry, 'O *New-England, New England*! whither art thou fallen!' when he knows, or might know, that our godly fathers, the firſt ſettlers of this country, both miniſters and churches, looked upon the coming in of *anabaptiſm*, as one of the greateſt *corruptions* that took place among them; and an entire perverting of the deſign of their coming into this wilderneſs. 'Do not wrong and marr an 'excellent work and profeſſion (ſaid holy *Mitchel*) by mixing and 'weaving in ſpurious principles or practices; as thoſe of *ſeparation*, *anabaptiſm*, *morellian* (anarchical) confuſion. If any would 'ſecretly twiſt in and eſpouſe ſuch things as thoſe, and make 'them part of *our intereſt*, we muſt needs renounce it as none of 'our cauſe, no part of the end and deſign of the Lord's faithful 'ſervants, when they followed him *into this land, that was not 'ſown. Separation* and *anabaptiſm* (ſays he) are wonted *intruders*, 'and ſeeming *friends*, but *ſecret, fatal enemies* to reformation.*

Why did not his heart ſmite him, and his pen blot out that expreſſion, of his deep concern for *New-England*, as fallen from its antient purity and glory, becauſe her miniſters do now teſtify againſt the corruptions of *ſeparation* and *anabaptiſm*, juſt as the *fathers* in the *firſt* churches did: who declared them to be '*fatal enemies to reformation.*'——In *theſe reſpects*, tis true indeed, that *New England* is ſadly fallen! and tis very much by ſuch hands as Mr. *Backus* and the *ſeparates*, who have done what they could to

* Mitchel's Life, p. 98.

to pull down the *regular churches* of Chriſt, and to deſtroy the uſefulneſs of their *able* and *faithful miniſters*: and hereby to compleat the overthrow of *New-England*. Our name is *Ichabod*, —our glory departs from us, as the modern *ſeparation* prevails; our fathers being judges. And yet Mr. B. has the aſſurance to repreſent and treat the ſtanding churches as *apoſtates*—himſelf and ſeparates as the *reformers*: refering of us too to the fathers of New England, who roundly condemned both *him* and *them*.

Mr. B. profeſſes, p. 93, to give a more full and impartial account of the poiſoning of *John Smith*'s wife with *ratſbane*, than had been heretofore given. And having related that matter, in connection with the ſtory of one *Ward* of *Attleborough*, he ſays, 'This is the open ſtate of thoſe facts: and yet they have been 'caſt upon the ſeparates from one end of the land to the other, 'as evidences of the *bad tendency of their ſeparations*.'—Upon which I would juſt remark, that were it not with a view (as a hopeful means) to convince our ſeparate brethren, that they held ſome erroneous and dangerous principles, in that day, which carried them off from the churches, I ſhould *here* forbear to mention ſome very material & intereſting circumſtances relating to *that* man and the ſeparate church in *Canterbury*, of which he was a member: they being entirely omitted by Mr. B. which keeps the bad *tendency* of their ſeparating principles out of ſight, ſo far as it is pretended to appear in *that* affair. I am told that,

'This *John Smith* was a very vicious man, in many reſpects, 'before his ſuppoſed converſion.—That he was looked upon as 'a remarkable inſtance of converſion, by the ſeparates, ſo that 'when he was received into their church, he was declared, by 'their teacher, to be the *cleareſt* inſtance of converſion, that he 'almoſt ever knew; and not only fit to be a *member*, but a *pillar* 'of the church and a *preacher* of the goſpel: and that he was 'abundant in *exhortations*, and flocked after in many unſeaſona-'ble night meetings, &c.—And further, after he was excom-'municated, and was ſo ſtrongly ſuſpected, by ſeparates as well 'as others, of having a hand in that dreadful affair of poiſoning 'his wife,' (as Mr. B's own account implies) 'yea after he had 'married the woman ſuſpected of poiſoning her, yet, ſo tenacious-'ly did they hold to their darling principle of a *certain knowlege* 'of *chriſtians*, that they retained their opinion of him as a *chriſti-'an* ſtill: and many of them brought the inſtance of the fall 'of *David*, *Peter*, &c. to juſtify their ſentiments.'—Theſe facts my informer aſſures me are *true*, and that the moſt of them might

be

be atteſted to, were it needful, by ſome of the moſt reſpectable perſons in the place.

This ſhows that the principle of a *certain knowlege* of *chriſtians* (which I ſpake of in my ſermons) prevailed among the ſeparates, in other places, as well as among my own brethren, that withdrew from my church and miniſtry, with a view to gather a *pure church*, conſiſting of *true believers* only, upon that very principle of a *certain knowlege*, &c.

And this is one of the '*imperfect attempts*, that thoſe are making, to reſtore the antient diſcipline,' whom Mr. B. complains of me for publicly *ſtigmatizing*, p 93 —It grieves me to relate theſe things—For I feel tender for the cauſe and people of God, profeſſing his holy religion; leſt they that are enemies to it, ſhould blaſpheme, on account of the follies of thoſe that have ſet themſelves up for *reformers*, upon principles that are not in the bible. Let our ſeparate brethren, thro' the land, be ſo *honeſt* as to *own* they *once* held the principle above, and now be *humble* enough to confeſs it as an *error*, and put it away, with a number more, of like complexion, that rent our churches, and I ſhould be ready to *hope* that we might come and worſhip together again, and *live* and *love* as brethren, to the rejoicing of my heart; which is my end in all I've ſaid.

Chapter XIII.

Chriſtians, *all withdrawing from* unbelievers—*Text in my title page*, They are not all Iſrael, *&c. conſidered—Atteſtation to the account given of the ſeparations.*

IN p. 154, my ſermons, I mention it as an evidence of their wanting a truly chriſtian ſpirit, 'that the ſeparates endeavored to draw off from us, every true believer or chriſtian (in their ſenſe of the word) and would have left a congregation behind them of nothing but—graceleſs perſons,' &c.

Mr. B. p. 94, owns the charge and juſtifies their conduct, ſaying, 'If he had reviewed a text that ſtands as a motto in his title page, Ezek. 43. 10, 12. *This is the law of the houſe: upon the top of the mountain, the whole limit thereof round about, ſhall be* MOST HOLY, &c. and alſo had taken notice, that the terms given to another prophet, were, *if thou take forth the precious from the vile*, Jer. 15. 19. and that the holy Spirit expreſly com-

'mands us in the new teſtament, 2 Cor. 6. 14—17. *to come out* '*and be ſeparate from* UNBELIEVERS; and 2 Tim. 3 5 *to turn* '*away from thoſe who have* THE *form, but deny the power of godli-*'*neſs*: if he had duly obſerved *theſe* rules, how could he ever 'have charged the *acting upon them*, as the firſt evidence that 'thoſe who *acted ſo*, had not the Spirit that indited them,' &c.

Reply. If *theſe ſcriptures*, in the ſenſe he uſes them, do juſtify my ſeparate brethren, in drawing off all the chriſtians from *our* congregations, (or endeavoring of it) and leaving only hypocrites and graceleſs perſons to ſhift for themſelves, 'without the bene-'fit of one ſaint, to aſſiſt them, in the affairs of their ſouls,' then they teach a rule of conduct, for all other religious aſſemblies, in ſimilar caſes. And ſo it will follow, that Mr. *Backus*, thinking himſelf a chriſtian, with all other ſaints in his congregation, and the like of the ſeparate churches, muſt draw off by themſelves—come out from among the *unbelievers* and be *ſeparate*, leaving all the hypocrites and graceleſs perſons behind them: (for, in the preſent queſtion, there is no *fault* or *cauſe*, ſuppoſed, but want of *converting grace*:) And then they muſt either not have the ordinances of God's houſe, and public means of grace, or elſe, only AS they are adminiſtred and received by unconverted men. By his way of arguing, from theſe ſcriptures, this conſequence is undeniable.—But it applied to *them*, I can't think they would *walk by this rule, or mind the ſame thing*. And indeed, it is too ſhocking, to admit one favorable thought of it. Therefore,

'Tis evident, I think, that, miſtaking the ſenſe, he miſapplies each of thoſe ſcriptures. Ezek. 43. 12. *The top of the mountain* (upon which the temple for worſhip ſtood) *ſhall be* MOST HOLY, i. e. *hallowed*, accounted *moſt holy*, entirely devoted to ſacred uſe. And taken figuratively, ſhows that the Lord's people who meet to worſhip *there*, ſhould all be *holy*; ceremonially holy, at leaſt, and *ought* to be *really* ſo, as they ſhall be, in the latter days.—— But how does this import, that the *ſaints* ſhould ſeparate from the ſinners, while there are *ſuch*, and deprive them of the benefit of their prayers, holy example, and other means of their converſion? This, ſurely, would be doing violence to the text.

That in Jer. 15. 19 *If thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou ſhalt be as my mouth*—'Separate the precious truths of God 'from the vile conceits of men, or rather preach ſo as to diſtin-'guiſh good and bad men one from another, then God would con-'tinue him as *his* prophet, to *ſpeak* in his name unto the people;'* fairly

* Mr. Pool.

fairly intimated in thoſe words, *thou ſhalt be as my mouth.* Not that the Lord directs Jeremiah to go and pick out all the ſaints, from a religious aſſembly, and ſet them elſewhere to worſhip, leaving all the Chriſtleſs ſinners by *themſelves;* as Mr. B. carries it, or he ſays nothing to the purpoſe. This would be acting indeed like the ſhepherd, that picks out the white ſheep from the black——All agreeable to their *certain knowlege* of chriſtians. 2 Cor. 6. 14—17. *Come out from among them, and be ye ſeparate,* as St Paul expreſſes it.—Come out from whom? The relative *them,* leads back to ſee of whom the apoſtle was ſpeaking: and we find v. 16. that they were *idolaters*—ſuch as worſhipped *idols,* in their temples. *What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye* (chriſtians) *are the temple of the living God. Wherefore* (as v. 17) *come out from among them,* i. e. *them* that worſhip *idols,* literally and viſibly; or from open *idolaters*: and from all *needleſs* connection, intimacy or fellowſhip, with other ſcandalous ſinners.—But ſurely Paul does not here intend, that chriſtians ſhould ſeparate themſelves from every worſhipping aſſembly, where there are *unconverted* perſons, and merely *becauſe ſuch* are *there,* (as in the preſent queſtion) or even if the idolatrous heathen ſhould come in, to hear the word, *occaſionally*: —much leſs *where* the *brethren* and *children* of believing parents, educated in the chriſtian way, but as yet unregenerate, aſſemble themſelves to hear the word, that they may be converted—as decently attending, too, in outward appearance, as the ſaints themſelves. This, I ſay, cannot be *Paul's* meaning. Mr. B. upon a *review,* I am perſuaded, does not—cannot *think* ſo: and yet he actually *ſays* ſo. *Come out and be ſeparate from unbelievers,* (ſays he) in which term he leaves it, including all that have not *ſaving faith* tho' profeſſing chriſtianity. Yea, and he muſt be underſtood to *intend* ſuch, or elſe he ſays nothing to the point in hand, between me and him; for *ſuch* were the *unbelievers* or graceleſs perſons, that I ſpake of, as being ſeparated from.——But more than this; Mr. B (which ſeems a light thing with him) *reads* the text wrong. *Be ye ſeparate from* UNBELIEVERS, ſays Mr. B.—— Paul ſays, *Come out from among* THEM, *and be ye ſeparate,* i e. from *them.* From whom? Anſwer, from *idolaters,* as before, v. 16. i. e. viſible heatheniſh idolatry. But he may ſay, are not all *ſuch* idolaters, *unbelievers?* Yes: but all unbelievers are not *ſuch idolaters,* as Paul there commands chriſtians to ſeparate from. And as for *ſecret, heart idols,* ſaints as well as ſinners muſt go out of the world, before they will get entirely free of them.

The

The laſt text he quotes, 2 Tim. 3. 5. *Turn away* from thoſe who have THE *form*, but *deny the power of godlineſs*, is alſo *read* wrong, and *applied* worſe.——Paul does not ſay THE form, but A *form*. There is THE form of *ſound words*—which we are to *hold faſt*; and ſo, THE form of divine ſervice, which *God* has inſtituted, to be religiouſly obſerved, and not triſled with. And there is *A* form of godlineſs, which *man* invents and ſets up, and ſo not binding to chriſtians, widely different from THE form which is of God.——His *application*, alſo, of this text, is quite abuſive—to *Paul*, as he corrupts his meaning—to *me* and *brethren*, as *we* were the only congregation, which the *paſſage*, we are upon, can poſſibly refer to. And as he applies this text to *us*, he brings forward all the black characters, drawn in the three preceeding verſes, and faſtens them upon *us*; which, I ſhall only tell him, *we* don't deſerve;—and which I wiſh that *he* and his brethren, the *ſeparates*, may be entirely waſhed from——Thus evidently are the texts above, abuſed by Mr. B. and by the ſeparates too, 'if they acted upon them,' in their drawing off, &c. as Mr. B. ſays they did, p. 94.—Surely 'they had not the 'Spirit that indited them.'

'Indeed,' (ſays he, p. idem) 'the other text in his title page, '*They are not all Iſrael which are of Iſrael*, plainly points us to the 'way, that *theſe miniſters* get along in, concerning theſe affairs. 'They *confound* the conſtitution of the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian* 'church together, and *ſhuffle* and *ſhift* from one thing to the 'other, as occaſion ſuits; and then charge us with not diſtin-'guiſhing between the viſible and inviſible church.'

Reader, you'll obſerve that theſe words under conſideration, are the words of the apoſtle to the Gentiles, in his epiſtle to the *Chriſtian* church, or ſaints at *Rome*, Rom. 9. 6. And inaſmuch as they ſtand, in my title page, juſt as they were written, by the apoſtle in that epiſtle, without any paraphraſe of my own upon them, I don't ſee why Mr. B. may not juſt as well ſay of *Paul* and *his* brethren in the miniſtry, as he does of *me* and *mine*, viz. 'This text plainly points us to the way, that theſe miniſters,' (*Paul, Barnabas, Peter, James* and *John*) 'get along in, concern-'ing theſe affairs. They confound the conſtitution of the *Jew-'iſh* and *Chriſtian* church together; and ſhuffle and ſhift from 'one to the other as occaſion ſuits.' For who of all *writers* or *preachers*, does ſo much as *Paul* and the other apoſtles, at connect-ing the Jewiſh and Chriſtian churches together; ſhewing, that the *latter* ſprings out of the former; or rather, is but a continua-

tion

tion of the *same* church. Tho' the visible œconomy is changed, yet the churches are essentially the same; insomuch as that the *Christian* church is called by the same name as the *Jewish* was, Gal. 6. 16. *As many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them and mercy, and upon the* ISRAEL *of God.* 'Upon the true 'Israelites, whom he calleth the *Israel of God*, hereby intimating, 'and confirming the truth of what he had said, Rom. 2. 28, 29. '*He is not a Jew that is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward, in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, 'and circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit,*' &c. Mr. *Peel.* ——And this explains the text in my title page, *they are not all Israel which are of Israel*; not all true *Israelites*, or *Israelites indeed*, (as *Nathaniel*, a new testament saint was called) which descend from *Israel* or *Jacob*: but they only who walk in the faith of their father *Abraham*. So, they are not *all* the *Israel* of God, in the gospel sense, or true christians, that are called by the christian name. But, as Gal. 3. 29. *If ye be Christ's*, (i. e. true believers in Christ) *then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.* For of Abraham tis said, Rom. 4. 11. *That he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also.* So Eph. 2. 20. *And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.* The *apostles*, the teachers of the *Christian* church; and the *prophets*, of the *Jewish*; both founded on *Christ*, who *supports* and *unites* them together.

Let Mr. B. shew that *I* or my *brethren* in the ministry, make use of *terms* or *passages* of scripture, refering to Jewish affairs, more *than*, or in a different sense *from* what the apostles do, before he is so free with his censures: or let him learn, himself, to distinguish the constitutions—to set them in a clear light, and to keep them distinct, each by itself, before he presumes to talk of our *confounding* them together.——'Till then, I leave him to make it up with *Paul* and the rest of the apostles, for the strange indignities he has offered, in charging them with 'confounding 'the constitution of the *Jewish* and *Christian* church together, 'and shuffling and shifting from one to the other, as occasion 'suits:' For tis the *apostle* and not *us*; at least *him* as well as *us*, whom he here reproaches; seeing I only *mentioned* his words, and (for aught that appears in my book) in *the very same sense*, wherein he intended to be understood.

There are many more exceptionable things—very offensive, and of pernicious tendency, in Mr. *Backus*'s book, which should have

have been corrected; as I fully intended, and indeed had prepared to do: but I have so greatly exceeded the bounds that I set myself, and hoped to keep within, that if any of my readers patience, has reached to this period, I have only to acknowlege it with gratitude; and humbly to ask the blessing of God upon what has been already offered, agreeable to his will.

TO CONCLUDE.

AS to what Mr. *Backus* has offered, under his *fourth* head, or part, called 'Remarks upon what Mr. F. has wrote concerning 'baptism,' had he said any thing that really entered into the merits of the cause, as might have been expected, from a fair and rational disputant, I should, doubtless, have taken proper notice of it.——But, as I could not see that he had *answered* my arguments, or even *touched* them with any thing to the purpose, I therefore leave him undisturbed, in that part of his labours.

But since he has made very free with my *moral character*—repeatedly and rudely charging me with *falsehood*, in the representation I have given of the *separations* among us, it is thought needful (the *judicious* advising thereto) that I should wipe off *that* reproach by living testimonies.

In his book, pref. p. 5 he says, 'That to be silent now,' (after I had charged certain *errors*, *principles*, and *groundless offences*, upon the *separates*, p. 164 my sermons) 'would be a letting 'many things pass for *truths*, which *I knew were not so*.'—And p. 65. 'I have proved' (says he) 'that he charges us *falsely*, as to 'our shutting out *learning*'—Again, p. 80.—'Only to give *another proof* of his being a *false accuser*.'—Once more, p. 91. 'The 'chief which he advances against us, before the world, is upon 'his own *word of honor*.'——To which, many other like accusations might be produced out of his book, and added, were it needful.

I hope the attentive reader has been satisfied, with respect to the *truth* of numbers of accused passages as they have been cleared up in the foregoing remarks.—And as to *other* things related in my account of the *separations*, I trust that every one who is disposed to entertain *the truth* will be satisfied, as to my *veracity*, from the following *attestations*; which might, I suppose, have been increased, from among the inhabitants of this town, to as great a number as the most *diffident* could desire: besides which, there are witnesses enough, ready to testify to the *same* or *like* things, from every quarter, in neighbouring towns and distant places.

places. But I thought it a needleſs labour, to ſummon *multitudes* to prove, what every one, almoſt, *then living*, has a witneſs for in his own breaſt.

Atteſtations.

WE the ſubſcribers, living at *Stonington*, in the time of the religious concern about 27 years ago, Do teſtify, that what Mr. Fiſh has written in his *Nine Sermons* upon Mat. 16. 18. as to the *conduct* and *practice* of the people, that ſeparated from the ſtanding churches in this town, is, in general, *the truth*: we being perſonally acquainted with what happened in thoſe times, by *ſeeing* and *hearing* almoſt *every thing* that is related in thoſe Sermons.

Stonington, March 27, 1769. { GEORGE DARROW, PHEBE DARROW.

Stonington, March 21, 1771. { JAMES MASON, SARAH MASON.

WE the ſubſcribers, having read the Nine Sermons of the Rev. Mr. Joſeph Fiſh, on Matth. 16. 18. do judge that he has given a juſt account and true repreſentation, in thoſe Sermons, of the *ſpirit*, *conduct*, and *errors* of thoſe perſons, who ſeparated from the ſtanding churches.

WILLIAM MORGAN,
JOSEPH DENISON,
BENJAMIN BLOGGET.

Stonington, Feb. 19, 1771.

Appendix.

Appendix.

IN reading over the piece, that I have had under examination, I met with a great number of *expreſſions*, ſo void of *decency*, *good nature*, and many other *vertues*, becoming a chriſtian writer, that I did not think them worthy of an anſwer. However, that I may improve them, ſomehow, to the author's advantage, I here return him a *few*, of the *many*, in their own *native dreſs*, as the moſt likely means of his conviction and humiliation.

The firſt of which kind, is, the *title* of his book, 'A *Fiſh caught* 'in his *own net*.'

And ſpeaking of the Biſhop of *Gloceſter*'s reflections upon the coloniſts, Mr. *Backus* ſays, pref. p. 5. 'Here is a character given 'to the world of Mr. *F*'s *churches*, by one who ſtands ſo much 'above them, that he treats *them* juſt as *they* treat *us*, namely, '*to accuſe without any proof*, but *great ſwelling words of their own*.'

P. 12. '*'Tis perfect madneſs* to ſet up our *ſuppoſitions* and *rea-* 'ſonings againſt *divine revelation*.

P. 20. '*Yea theſe very men*,' (i. e. the miniſters beforementioned) '*who cried ſo loud* for peace, yet *prepared ſuch war* againſt 'thoſe who *would not put into their mouths*, as not only to *load* 'them *with ſlander* and *reproach*, but alſo *to ſend their ſervants* and 'take *away their goods by force*.'

P. 24. 'We have a *ſet of men*, *in our days*, *who profeſs to be* 'Chriſt's *ambaſſadors*,'—'*if they once get footing in a town or pariſh*, 'let *people diſlike them ever ſo much*, *they will not go out*, *without a* 'conſiderable *quantity of white or yellow duſt*.'

N. B. The whole marginal note of p. 24. too long to repeat, is returned.

P. 44. '*Did any Phariſee ever abuſe ſcripture to impoſe upon* 'people, *worſe than this?*'

P. 67. —'Language not eaſily underſtood—And *who are* 'more guilty *of ſuch diſorders*, than *theſe great pretenders to learn-* 'ing? And *what can be a greater plague to the church*, than the 'ſetting *up men for miniſters*, *who never came to this knowlege of the* 'truth?'

P. 68. '*Does Mr. F. believe in his conſcience*, *that renewing* 'grace *is entailed to the colleges?*'

Idem.

Idem. 'The *right* of *trying miniſters*—which *Chriſt* has *given to his church*, is now *uſurped by the clergy*: and after *they* have thus *robbed* God's people of their *right*, they charge them with want of a good temper, if they will not be *eaſy under ſuch tyranny*.'

B. 70. 'We have ſeen one *claiming infallibility in his judgment*.'*—Idem. '*This new infallible tribunal*.'—P. 71. '*This* is the rule that our *new infallible judge gives ſentance upon*.'

P. 73. 'Several *ſcholars in our colleges*'—'*by the uſe of notes*'—'*learn to impoſe upon their tutors at college, and upon the people after they come from it*.'

P. 80. 'Is not the *liberty* which *they*,' (i. e. the miniſters) '*allow*, juſt the *ſame with Pharaoh's*;' '*Go ye ſerve the Lord, only let your flocks and your herds be ſtayed?*'

P. 84. '——Leſt *one miniſter* interfere with another,—for '*each one muſt look for his gain from his quarter*.'

P. 89. '*Miniſters* cannot diſcern it,' (i. e. covetouſneſs) '*at home, where they can never have enough*.'

Let *theſe* ſuffice for a ſpecimen of what his book is full of.

* In ſaying, where the evidence was clear, '*you may know for certain*.'

A LETTER.

Mr. ISAAC BACKUS,

SIR,

ABOUT two years ago I received one of your books, with the ſingular title above, returned; as a *preſent* from the author. And am really ſorry that it has been ſo long, before I could *properly* acknowlege your favor: which I now do; deſiring your acceptance, tho' late.

I aſſure you, Sir, that my long delay to publiſh the foregoing *remarks*, on your *piece*, has not been owing to any difficulty I met with, either to *diſintangle myſelf*, or to *confound the ſcheme you laid to take me*: but to other cauſes.

I hope the public will excuſe my taking this ſerious notice of your *performance*; as it nearly affected my character and the cauſe of the churches, tho' neither the *matter* nor *form*, were very inviting.—I am ſure that I have often and much regretted the labour; and ſhould gladly have been excuſed—not becauſe 'I think it beneath *my dignity* to take notice of *laymen's* wri-'tings,' as you reflect, pref. p. 7. but becauſe you have *written* with a *ſpirit*, and in a *manner*, beneath the *dignity* of a *chriſtian*, a man of *ſenſe*, *modeſty* and good breeding.——I ſhould therefore have ſaved myſelf and public the trouble of a reply; had it not been to *explain* ſome things in my ſermons, which I perceive were not rightly underſtood; and to correct a *circumſtantial* miſtake or two; as alſo further to clear up and defend ſome truths of importance, which you have attacked, with greater boldneſs, indeed, and aſſurance, than ſtrength of reaſoning, yet *ſo*, as to be *taking* with the more injudicious and unſtable part of mankind.

'Tis not my deſign, in this letter, to attempt to convince you of any error in *principle*, as to points controverted between us: the foregoing *remarks* muſt ſuffice for that purpoſe.

But what I would aim at (if I might hope for it) is, to make you, in ſome meaſure, ſenſible of the numerous *offences*, given in your book, by your indecent *behaviour*, in the *ill treatment* you have ſhown, towards thoſe whom you took upon you to deal with, both as to the *ſpirit* and *language* in which you wrote.

Things of this nature, were purpoſely paſſed over, as far as could

could well be, in the foregoing diſpute, leſt by a particular notice of them, as they frequently occurred, I ſhould interrupt the reader's attention to the argument.

But now I mean to point out ſome of thoſe offenſive things, and to reprove you therefor, in ſuch a manner, as the nature and aggravation of your crimes demand: and this, with a ſpecial view to your repentance and amendment; as alſo to obviate your concluding, from my paſt *ſilence*, that you have written with a *ſpirit* tolerably good and chriſtian like.

One thing I would remind you of, as opening to a ſight of your *offences* (which is not ſo properly a *crime*, as a great weakneſs and imperfection, which illy ſuits an *author* and a *diſputant*) is, the *confuſion* of *ideas*, and *croud* of *inconnected* things, with which your arguments are generally ſo incumbered, that 'tis hard to find your *meaning*, and harder ſtill to ſee the *conſequence*, you mean to draw. Yet we frequently hear you telling your readers, that you have *proved* this and the *other* point, (and doubtleſs ſome are fond enough to *believe* it) when you have really miſſed the object, and, after all, ſaid nothing to the purpoſe.——Is not *this to darken counſel, by words without knowlege?*

But *this* might be eaſily overlooked and pitied, as a human frailty, common to men, were it not for that unſufferable PERTNESS,—ſurprizing CONFIDENCE, and haughty air of ASSURANCE, with which you deliver your ſentiments and deal out your cenſures—in caſes too, where a ſmall degree of *modeſty*, or of true *humility*, would lead you to ſuſpect *yourſelf*, and lay a *reſtraint* upon your aſſuming pen.

But this offence is aggravated, by a total want of *good manners* and *civil language*, through a great part of your book: in reſpect to which it may be ſaid, *doth not even nature itſelf teach you?*

The *root* or *ſtock* that bears this evil fruit, is nothing leſs than *enmity* and *bitterneſs* of *ſpirit*; by which, Sir, you have unhappily diſtinguiſhed yourſelf, thro' the courſe of your writings; eſpecially towards your *author* and his *brethren* in the miniſtry; ſome *favorites* only excepted.

Had the *body* of the ſtanding miniſters, been really as *bad*, as you have repreſented them; how much more becoming, in you, would it have been, as a man of *decent manners* and a profeſſed *diſciple* of *Chriſt*, to have told us our faults and opened our danger, in modeſt terms; and then have reproved us, (to ſatisfy

your

your own conſcience) with meekneſs of ſpirit, and a temper good and kind?—We ſhould, doubtleſs, have underſtood your inoffenſive language—given a ſerious attention, and, more likely, have been won to repentance.—For, *how forcible are right words?* But inſtead of ſuch a chriſtian treatment, *you whet your tongue like a ſword, and bend your bow, to ſhoot your arrows even bitter words;* as if you tho't that *railing* at MINISTERS, was *neceſſary* (as men of prophane lips think of the oaths and aſſeverations which they uſe) to gain their attention and belief.——— You complain of 'galling *one another in perverſe diſputes, and ſtriving* 'about *words*, &c. in OUR DAY.' pref. p. 1.—— But where do you find any writings, upon controverſy, either in *our day*, or *in the days of Yore*, more filled up with 'galling *expreſſions* and 'perverſe diſputes,' than your 'Examination of the Nine Ser-'mons from Mat. 16. 18.'

If all that wrote upon controverſial ſubjects, had rudeneſs and ill temper enough, to treat *their* opponents, as coarſely, as you have done *yours*, no wonder if, not only 'ſome ſerious peo-'ple,' but even all that are not void of *humanity* itſelf, 'ſhould 'condemn all diſputing as—the cauſe of all the confuſions that 'appear,' &c. pref. p. 1.

But what is more ſurprizing and offenſive ſtill, is this, that (inſenſible of your being thus illy furniſhed) you ſhould ſet yourſelf up as *Cenſor General* of the preſent generation:——All *ranks* fall under your *ſage* correction and reproof:—as unequal to the exalted ſphere, as *Phaeton* to guide the chariot of the ſun: and as (the ſtory is) *he* ſet the *material* world on fire, ſo would *you* the *chriſtian*; if *all* that you have reviled, or otherwiſe treated with indignity, ſhould unbridle their tongues, or throw the reins upon the neck, as you have done, and *render evil for evil and railing for railing*.——But *we have not ſo learned Chriſt*.

I hope the *church* is not in any *great* danger from this quarter. And as for *yourſelf*, I believe you may reſt ſecure——The *baſeneſs* of your reflections and *bitterneſs* of your ſpirit (however provoking) will likely ſave you from the *angry blows* of your injured neighbours—For if *Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil—durſt not bring againſt him a railing accuſation*, (Jude 9) who, among the followers of Chriſt, dare enter the liſt with Mr *Backus*? The ſpirit of the goſpel forbids it—— you may bid defiance to every *chriſtian* pen.——You are alſo defended, and may likely eſcape, by the *ill ſavor* of your *writings*: on account of which *property*, you are aptly compared by Mr.

Flavel

Flavel† from *Camero*, to 'some cunning animals' (which) 'when 'purſued at the heels, drive away both dogs and huntſmen, 'with their *intollerable ſtench*.'

If you think my corrections are a little touched with *ſeverity*, be adviſed, Sir, to look over your book again, with impartiality and deliberation, and ſee if your *own pen*, upon a review, don't convince you, that your *baſe* and *injurious* treatment of *miniſters* and *churches*, (and of CHRIST in *them*) which have been ſo long the care of heaven, in this wilderneſs, has not *juſtly procured theſe things unto you*; and that the correction is gentle compared with the offence.——To be ſure, if you are not *aſhamed* of the *ſpirit* and *language* of your *piece*, (upon a ſecond reading) of which the *extracts* above are a ſpecimen, you muſt allow me to think that at preſent, you are beyond the reach of argument, and proof againſt the arrows of conviction.

I ſhall therefore leave you to the mercy of God and your own reflections, when I have remarked upon two paſſages of your book.

You tell us, pref. p. 9. 'That what little you do know, 'was gained in the ſchool which Dr. *Frank* ſpeaks of, where 'the higheſt wiſdom is, to know *Jeſus Chriſt and him crucified*, 'and wherein things are taught in an *experimental way*.'—And p. 119, bottom, and 120, top, you juſtly obſerve, 'That let 'us talk what we may of *defending truth* and promoting its 'cauſe, if at the ſame time, we advance *falſe arguments*, or diſ-'cover *a wrong temper* and *behaviour*, we *thereby contract guilt* '*to ourſelves and injure our fellow men*.'

And can you now, Sir, look over what you wrote, after the *firſt* obſervation, and ſeriouſly review what you *had* written, when you made the *laſt*, and then compare the *whole* with what you here ſay, and not bluſh to think that you are verily guilty of the crime, which you ſo juſtly condemn?

As to your *firſt* obſervation upon the ſchool that you ſpeak of, I remark, That if you were really brought up in *Chriſt's* ſchool, where you have been taught, by him, 'in an *experimental way*,' (as you, doubtleſs, intend we ſhould believe) then Chriſt has certainly given you a meaſure of *his Spirit*, even the ſpirit of *meekneſs*, *humility* and *gentleneſs*: for this is the firſt leſſon that he teaches his ſcholars, when they enter his ſchool.—*Come learn of me for I am meak and lowly of heart*.

Now, Sir, let *charity*, *which believeth all things*, *and hopeth all things*, ſuppoſe, that you have the ſpirit of Chriſt in the *ſeed*, and

† Glaſgow impreſſion, 1754, Vol. 1. p. 466.

and *principle* of it, (which I am not to determine) yet 'tis evident to all, that have been in *the school* you speak of, and *have learned* of *Christ*, that you was not under the *kind influence* of *his Spirit*, when you wrote and sent abroad your book, so full of *invectives, bitterness, clamour and evil speaking*, against his *ministers*, and others that stood in your way; tho' your aim seems chiefly at *Us*.

You tell the reader, pref p. 9. that 'you are a person of very little note in the *learned world*, and' (that you) '*never was a* '*member of their schools*.'—*This*, Sir, is what your *book* sufficiently proves—(Though I by no means despise you for *that*: but should have honored you, had you honored *yourself*, by honoring *Christ* and his *religion*.)—But when you tell us of your being a *member* of *Christ's school*, where you have been taught the '*knowlege of Jesus Christ and him crucified*,'—'taught things in an *experimental way*,'—(Insinuating, that the *learned ministers*, whom you was about to correct, had not such an education,—when you tell us of *your* being thus divinely taught, I say,) I have a right to *demand proof*—I have only 'your word of honor' for *that*.—your *writings* don't savor at all of *Christ's* school. Were I to judge of your *experimental acquaintance* with Christ, *solely* by your book of *examination*, &c. I should rather think you was never in the lowest *form* or *class* of *his school*, or ever within the doors of that house.—What! learn such *rude manners—ill behaviour—bad temper—reviling language*, (as runs thro' your book—learn *such things*) of *Jesus Christ!* 'Tis impossible!—The *experience*, that you speak of, is very illy connected with the *fruits* you have borne. Such *productions* are highly dishonorable to your professed master; and there must be a good degree of *charity* to suppose, that where they are so rank and strong, the *tree* is not, in itself—corrupt.

But I would hope better things of you, Sir,—that you have better evidences of a saving *acquaintance* with Christ, gained in *his school*, than those which you sent to *me*: and that the unchristian spirit and behaviour, that you have shown towards *me*, is not the *governing* and *habitual* temper of your mind, but rather *accidental*—the effect of temptation, error and mistake.

But, that I may not leave you wholly unconvinced of your faults, I would a little further observe,

You saw me every where friendly to the *work of God*, in those days; and while I exposed and reproved the *false principles, spirit* and *practise* of my erring brethren, you heard me frequently

and

and ſufficiently expreſs my charity, love and tenderneſs for their perſons. And ſurely *this* might commend me to the candor of my diſſenting brethren, and entitle me to civil treatment, from ſuch as were of different ſentiments.——But, where have you, Mr. *Backus* in your whole book of examination, corrected any of my *ſuppoſed* miſtakes, with a friendly temper, or treated *me* and *brethren*, the miniſters, with *chriſtian meekneſs*, or even with common civility?—If you have been hitherto inſenſible of the *ſpirit*, with which you wrote, I pray you look back and view yourſelf, in the mirror, which, by your help, I have ſet before you; and then enquire, whether you can perſuade yourſelf, that you received *that* image from Chriſt.

As to your *laſt* obſervation above, concerning '*falſe arguments* 'and *a wrong temper* and *behaviour*,' I think I have, in the foregoing treatiſe, plentifully proved, that you have advanced *falſe arguments*, as well as corrupted *ſcripture* and *miſuſed authors*, while your *work* itſelf demonſtrates, to every ſenſible reader, that you have 'diſcovered a *wrong temper* and *behaviour*,' in your profeſſed 'defence of truth,' and labours to 'promote its cauſe.' And therefore, according to your own judgment and ſentance, p. 120, 'you have contracted guilt to yourſelf and injured your fellow men.'

May the father of mercies grant you repentance, for the many evil and injurious things, that you have written againſt the *miniſters* of *Chriſt*, more eſpecially; leſt you be found at laſt among thoſe enemies, that *revile, perſecute and ſay all manner of evil againſt us falſly*, for his *ſake*.—May you receive a *better ſpirit*, and learn to treat your fellow chriſtians, and labourers in the vineyard, with more candor and with greater decency of ſpeech and behaviour, as well as to diſpute with greater clearneſs and conſiſtency, or be adviſed never more to appear in public.—— Your *wiſdom* will be known, *by holding your peace*: or if you ſhould think fit to reply, after the like manner that you have written already, you may depend upon being *neglected* by your friend and ſervant,

Stonington, December 25, 1770.

Joſeph Fiſh.

The Errata, here entered, are all that have been obſerved in the foregoing Pages—The candid and diſcerning reader, is deſired to correct the reſt.

E R R A T A.

Page	Line	From	
Title page	5-7	top	dele (.).
9	13	top	when *the*, read, when *they*.
9	17	top	between *nothing*, & *material*, r. *elſe*.
12	8	top	between *all*, & *them*, r. *of*.
18	5	bottom,	for *altered*, r. *uttered*.
20	17	top	*aid* r. *ſaid*.
21	1	bot.	r. *ſenſe*.
48	12	bot.	*being*, r. *bring*.
50	1	top	2d word *or*, r. *as*.
66	19	top	*prevent*, r. *pervert*.
77	8	bot.	*church*, r. *church's*.
77	4	bot.	*ap*probrious, r. *op*probrious.
79	15	bot.	*ſaid* indeed, r. *ſad* indeed.
88	6	bot.	*import*, r. *imports*.
90	5	bot.	*ſtrongly*, r. *ſtrangely*.
105	8	top	*miniſter*, r. *miniſters*.
106	15	top	next to *firſt miniſter*, add *in Stonington*
114	21	top	*euly*, r. *only*.